Evolution OF THE SANSKRIT LANGUAGE

FROM PĀṆINI TO PATAÑJALI

S. D. LADDU

Dr. LADDU's stand amounts to this: Sanskrit was a living language during the period of the Munitraya and, therefore, it underwent changes. The observations of Kātyāyana and Patañjali are based on actual usage in their times .... Though there may be results of evolution among the examples given by Patañjali, it is not at all easy to pick them out. Dr. LADDU himself points out the difficulties, theoretical and practical, in picking them out .... But he has done his best and has tried to maintain a thoroughly sober and objective attitude, balancing the possibilities that the available evidence would point to. He has a fine feeling for History in the evolution of the Sanskrit language.

—K. A. SUBRAMANIA IYER
Retired Professor of Sanskrit,
Lucknow University

EVOLUTION OF THE SANSKRIT LANGUAGE FROM PĀṆINI TO PATAÑJALI

S. D. LADDU

UNIVERSITY OF POONA

EVOLUTION OF THE SANSKRIT LANGUAGE FROM PĀṆINI TO PATAÑJALI

Primary Formations

(Pāṇini 3.1.91 — 3.2.83)

By

Sureshachandra Dnyaneshwar Laddu

CENTRE OF ADVANCED STUDY IN SANSKRIT
1974

*This thesis was accepted by the University of Poona for
the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in February 1967
and is now published by the University with the financial assistance
from the University Grants Commission, New Delhi.*

•

First Edition : December 1974

•

© *University of Poona*

•

Price : Rs. Forty

Printed by Shri M. S. Latkar at Shrisaraswati Mudranalaya, Plot No. 76, 'E' Block.
Bhosari, Poona 26 and published by Shri G. J. Abhyankar, Registrar, University of
Poona, Ganeshkhind, Poona 411007.

In the Sacred Memory of

my uncle,
Professor Tukaram Krishna Laddu
b. 19.2.1883] [*d.* 23.11.1919

and

my father,
Principal Dnyaneshwar Krishna Laddu
b. 26.2.1879] [*d.* 3.3.1962

CONTENTS

Foreword ix

Preface xiii

Analytical Table of Contents for Part II xv

PART I

Introduction

SECTION I : PRINCIPLES (3-30)

(A) The Basis of Ancient Indian Grammarians . . . 3

(B) Principles of the Grammarians 8

(C) Problems in the Study of Evolution : Theoretical and Practical 12

SECTION II : GRAMMAR (31-41)

(A) The Section of Grammar Selected 31

(B) Principles Underlying Derivation 31

(C) Processes of Primary Formation 32

(D) About the Suffixes Treated 37

Plan and Presentation

(A) Scope of the Study 42

(B) General Lines of Study 42

(C) Procedural Explanation 43

(D) List of Works and Authors under Reference with Abbreviations and Editions) 45

PART II

The Picture of the Evolution 53

A Brief Analysis of the Findings 241

PART III

Indices and Appendices

I. A Post-Script 257

II. Index to Free and Sopapada Kṛdanta-s . . . 260

III. Index to Forms Not Used As Free or Sopapada Kṛdanta-s . 267

IV. Index to Bound Kṛdanta-s 270

V. Index to Roots with Corresponding Free and Bound Kṛdanta-s 273

VI. Index to Derivations, Lexical Notes and Technical Terms . 276

VII. Index to Names of Modern Scholars . . . 279

VIII. Subject Index 281

IX. Errata 288

Foreword

It gives me great pleasure to write this Foreword to a book which is the revised form of the thesis on which I had seen Dr. S. D. LADDU at work day after day during the short periods of my stay some years ago at the Deccan College Post-Graduate and Research Institute, Poona, in connection with my work on Bhartṛhari's *Vākyapadīya*. Occasionally, we used to have talks about his work and about what else he could do after finishing what he had on hand. Here in this work we have the results of an intensive study of a well-delimited subject, namely, the Evolution of the Sanskrit Language from Pāṇini to Patañjali, with reference to the *Kṛt* or Primary Formations delimited to those that are taught in P. 3.1.91 to 3.2.83, that is, in just 143 *Sūtra-s*, together with the *Vārttika-s* of Kātyāyana and the *Mahābhāṣya* of Patañjali on 69 out of them. These *Kṛt* suffixes are to be added to roots in the sense of the agent (*kartā*), but without reference to any aspect of time as connoted by the expressions, ***bhūte***. *vartamāne* or ***bhaviṣyati***.

The very title of the subject raises a big problem. The problem has been stated very clearly by Dr. S. D. JOSHI and Dr. J. A. F. ROODBERGEN in sec. 2 (pp. v-x) of their Introduction to *Patañjali's Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya : Ayayībhāvatatpuruṣāhnika*. Not only has the problem been stated, but the two scholars have also made their attitude towards the problem quite clear. The problem is : Did Kātyāyana and Patañjali write in order to bring Pāṇini's grammar uptodate in order to keep abreast of the evolution of the language since Pāṇini's time ? They found that in some cases Pāṇini's rules did not work properly, because Pāṇini had not taken these cases into account, either through oversight or unfamiliarity due to the usage in question belonging to another region or having originated only after Pāṇini. Drs. JOSHI and ROODBERGEN make their position clear by saying : "The question is not whether a development of Sanskrit has taken place after Pāṇini, but whether we can ascertain such a development from the statements made by Kātyāyana and Patañjali and from Patañjali's examples." (p. viii : 2.6.) "Therefore, on purely theoretical grounds, the question, whether we can infer an evolution of Sanskrit from the examples, must be answered in the negative". (p. x : 2.9.)

This opinion and conclusion was published by the two scholars in 1969, after having seen the thesis (more particularly, the Introduction to the thesis) of Dr. LADDU which was submitted to the University of Poona in 1966. It seems to question the very validity of the subject of the thesis and, therefore, of the present book. The thesis had been written on the assumption that Sanskrit was the spoken language of the educated and the cultured at the time of Pāṇini, Kātyāyana and Patañjali and that it evolved during that period, resulting in the elimination of old forms, the emergence of new ones, or the development of phonetic, morphological, semantic and accentual changes in the old ones. It is natural that Dr. LADDU should take not of the above opinion and conclusion, coming as it does from such eminent scholars of the Pāṇinian system as Dr. JOSHI and his collaborator. It is clear that, before handing over the press-copy of his thesis for publication, Dr. LADDU has given fresh thought to the whole question, and has described his stand in the following words :—

"To restate matters, there are as we now know, no two opinions on :

1. the fact of the living, and hence growing, organism that the Sanskrit language was during the entire period of the Munitraya;

2. the fact of the actual usage in speech having been most respected by them and been made the basis of their treatment of the language; and

3. the fact that, being mostly innocent of the historical concept, their records try to fit in most of the new developments within the original rule of Pāṇini by applying to it various devices of interpretation.

" Acceptance of these basal facts lends to our study the only direction of interpreting the interpretations of Kātyāyana and Patañjali. The same weapon of interpretation as employed by the two sages, if cautiously turned upon themselves, is capable of producing useful results. "

(—*Introduction*, p. 19.)

Dr. LADDU's stand, as restated after his fresh thought, amounts to this :—Sanskrit was a living language during the period of the Munitraya and, therefore, it underwent changes. The observations of Kātyāyana and Patañjali are based on actual usage in their times. Kātyāyana did not think and could not have thought in terms of making the grammar of Pāṇini uptodate in order to take into account forms which had developed in the living Sanskrit language as a result of the passage of time. Their statements and examples were meant to serve another purpose, namely, to make the grammar of Pāṇini complete and perfect. In doing so, they have taken into account some forms which had actually evolved after Pāṇini, though they did not think in those terms at all. If it is true that some of the examples given by Patañjali are newly-evolved forms, then it is open to the modern linguist to interpret the work of the two later Munis as trying to bring the work of Pāṇini uptodate, at least as far as these forms are concerned. That would be a modern interpretation of their work, though not the conscious aim of Kātyāyana and Patañjali, because they were, as Dr. LADDU himself says, "mostly innocent of the historical concept."

Though there may be results of evolution among the examples given by Patañjali, it is not at all easy, to pick them out. Dr. LADDU himself points out, somewhat in detail, the difficulties, theoretical and practical, in picking them out. " Neither is the ground clear nor the skl, whichever instance from the *Laukika* we choose. ..... It is thus only with a special effort directed along accepted lines of research that the possibility of evolution through the works of Kātyāyana and Patañjali can be explored with a degree of exactitude." (—*Introduction*, p. 19.)

Well, Dr. LADDU has made the special heroic effort in the book which is now being published. It is for scholars to decide to what extent he has been successful. But he has done his best and has tried to maintain a thoroughly sober and objective attitude, balancing the possibilities that the available evidence would point to. He is fortunate to have had, during the stage of preparation of this work, the guidance of two mature scholars at the Deccan College, namely, Pandit K. A. SIVARAMAKRISHNA SASTRI, deeply familiar with the Vyākaraṇa tradition, and Dr. M. A. MEHENDALE, whose balanced and critical scholarship is well known. In his present version of that earlier study, apart from the fresh thinking that Dr. LADDU has closely given to the theoretical and practical aspects of the problem (as mentioned above), in the numerous additions and revisions that he has incorporated in the body of the earlier work, he has increasingly shown a keen critical spirit, infinite patience in collecting facts, adequate knowledge of the work done and being done by other scholars in the field (sparing no pains in making uptodate his referencing to the newly published critical editions etc.), and a fine feeling for History in the evolution of the Sanskrit language.

It is very fortunate that one of the subjects of research in Sanskrit chosen by the University of Poona for its Department of Sanskrit and for its Centre of Advanced Study in Sanskrit, under the stewardship of such an eminent scholar as Professor R. N. DANDEKAR (joined now by Professor S. D. JOSHI), is Vyākaraṇa, Sanskrit Grammar. As can be seen from the titles of the books and papers already published by the C.A.S.S., it is chiefly the Pāṇinian System of Grammar which is benefitting by the intensive study which is going on in this Institution, but the other Systems of Grammar are by no means excluded. Now that Dr. LADDU has entered his life's career at the Poona University, he is lucky to have, as his senior colleague, such a brilliant and thorough scholar as Dr. S. D. JOSHI. Helped by such persons and living in a city like Poona where the atmosphere for Sanskrit studies is very favourable, Dr. LADDU, besides carrying the responsibility for many years as Joint Editor of the *Indian Antiquary* (Third Series), is engaged at present in various research projects, such as an annotated English translation of Bhartṛhari's Commentary (*Dīpikā*) on the *Mahābhāṣya* and an Index-cum-Concordance of Sanskrit Grammatical *Vārttika-s* which, when completed, will represent a substantial contribution to the progress of studies in the Pāṇinian System. I wish Dr. LADDU complete success in his undertakings.

K. A. SUBRAMANIA IYER

"Hindska",
38, Major Banks Road,
Lucknow (U.P.).
30-11-1974

Preface

The present enquiry was carried on by me at the Deccan College Post-Graduate and Research Institute, Poona-6, for the doctoral dissertation that was submitted to the Poona University in July 1966. The work was done under the guidance of Professor Dr. M. A. MEHENDALE. The relevant portion of the *Mahābhāṣya* together with the Commentaries of Kaiyaṭa and Nāgeśa I read with Śāstraratnākara Prof. K. A. SIVARAMAKRISHNA SASTRI (then, Sub-Editor at the Sanskrit Dictionary Project of the Institute). I am extremely grateful to these two great scholars for all that I received from them, from Prof. MEHENDALE with his well-known critical scholarship and humane attitude and from Prof. SIVARAMAKRISHNA SASTRI with his rare thoroughness in Traditional learning. Indeed, if anything amounting to accuracy and good reasoning be found in the study that is wholly due to them, the responsibility for the imperfections that there must be in such a study being entirely mine.

During the period of my study I was required to go on long leave from my duties then at the Sanskrit Dictionary Project : for making that possible as well as for the U.G.C. Research Scholarship I could get then, I am grateful to Dr. S. M. KATRE, the then Director of the Institute. I am also thankful to the Librarian of the Institute, Shri V. B. BALSARE, and his staff, for all the benefit I received through their courtesy and promptitude from the priceless collection of the Institute's Library.

Among those who later read the thesis either entirely or in parts, I must mention Acharya V. P. LIMAYE, Dr. S. D. JOSHI (now Professor and Head of the Department of Sanskrit and Prakrit Languages, University of Poona) and Professor Dr. G. V. DEASTHALI: I am indebted to them for some very valuable suggestions they made. Further, it was Professor Dr. A. M. GHATAGE (now Director, Deccan College P.-G. & R.I.) who made some comments relating to my earlier discussion on the Problems faced in the study of evolution and to the earlier Analysis of the Findings at the end. It was these, and the references to my thesis in that form made by Drs. JOSHI and ROODBERGEN in the Introduction to the second Volume of the annotated translation of the *Mahābhāṣya*, that prompted me to give a fresh and more close thought on these two points. The result is the presentation of the two Sections here in a thoroughly recast form. I am very grateful to these scholars for the remarks offered by them.

Other revisions are of a comparatively minor nature : of attempting to keep the study and the references as uptodate as possible; and it is hoped nothing significant is left out of consideration. Many Indexes are also prepared newly and are expected to be of use to scholars.

It is needless to dwell here on the nature of the theoretical discussion that follows or on the line of the whole presentation. That has been done in a masterly manner by a scholar of the ripeness and eminence of Professor K. A. SUBRAMANIA IYER in his *Foreword.* It was my singular fortune to have that from out of his busy schedule of studies which is maintained at this age. All the inspiring and appreciative words coming from him I take more as an expression of his benignness and of his love for the science. As has been rightly said by him, it is for the critics to pronounce their views on the degree of success attained in the present enquiry on a theme that is acceptedly beset with controversies and evasive of any perfection in its solutions. I am sure of an act of kindness from them by being thorough and unsparing in criticism and thereby expanding the horizons of light to be of benefit to future strides being made along more well-informed and exact paths.

I am extremely beholden to the authorities of the Poona University for choosing to publish the present work, and am particularly grateful to the kind and persistent interest shown in every respect in it by Professor R. N. DANDEKAR (till recently, Director of the Centre of Advanced Study in Sanskrit at the Poona University) and by Professor S. D. JOSHI. The Superintendent of Publications, Shri D. K. SHEWAKAR, has exerted his best to see that the publication is done with elegance and efficiency, in which he was matched with characteristic enthusiasm and interest by Shri M. S. LATKAR, the Proprietor of the Shrisaraswati Mudranalaya, and his staff. I am sincerely thankful them. Shri Alekha Chandra SARANGI, a Research Scholar in the Centre of Advanced Study in Sanskrit at the Poona University, deserves my special thanks for helping me in reading the proofs with keenness and care. For the errors in printing, the responsibility is mine.

C.A.S.S., S. D. LADDU
University of Poona,
Poona - 411007.
Campā-Ṣaṣṭhī,
20.12.1974

Analytical Table of Contents

For Part II

- Figures in bold type refer to Observation-numbers.

The Picture of the Evolution

A. THE KṚTYA FORMATIONS 53

A–1. The Kṛtya Forms in General 53

<< 1 >> *kelimar* (*e'ima*) ... ... **(1)** 53–54
<< 2 >> *tavyat* ($tavya_1$), *tavya* ($tavya_2$) ... ... **(2–3)** 55–57
<< 3 >> *yat* (ya_1) ... ... **(4–14)** 58–69
<< 4 >> *kyap* (ya_2) ... ... **(15–27)** 70–80
<< 5 >> *ṇyat* (ya_3) ... ... **(28–49)** 81–99

A–2. Extra-ordinary Cases of Kṛtya Forms
yat (ya_1) **(50–51)** 100–102

A–3. General Semasiology of Kṛtya Forms **(52)** 103–105

B. THE TṚJĀDI-ENDING FORMATIONS 106

B–1. General Significance of Tṛjādi-ending Forms **(53)** 106–107

B–2. Forms Appearing Like Kṛtya-s **(54)** 108–110

B–3. The Tṛjādi-ending Forms in General 111

<< 1 >> *ṇvul* (aka_1) ... ... **(55–60)** 111–114
<< 2 >> *tṛc* ($tṛ_1$) ... ... **(61)** 115
<< 3 >> *ac* (a_1) ... ... **(62–79)** 116–135
<< 4 >> *ka* (a_2) ... ... **(80–91)** 136–147
<< 5 >> *śa* (a_3) ... ... **(92–94)** 148–153
<< 6 >> *ṇa* (a_4) ... ... **(95)** 155
<< 7 >> *ṣvun* (aka_2) ... ... **(96)** 156–161
<< 8 >> *vun* (aka_3) ... ... **(97)** 163–164
<< 9 >> *aṇ* (a_5) ... ... **(98–112)** 165–188
<<10>> *ṭak* (a_6) ... ... **(113–117)**189–196

<<11>> *ṭa* (a_7) ... ... **(118-122)** 197-200
<<12>> *in* (i_1) ... ... **(123-124)** 201-202
<<13>> *khaś* (a_8) ... ... **(125-127)** 203-208
<<14>> *khac* (a_9) ... ... **(128-129)** 209-210
<<15>> *ḍa* (a_{10}) ... ... **(130-132)** 211-216
<<16>> *khyun* (ana_3) ... ... **(133)** 2 7-219
<<17>> *khiṣṇuc* (*iṣṇu*) ... ... **(134)** 220-221
<<18>> *kvin* (zero$_1$) ... ... **(135-136)** 222-224
<<19>> *kañ* (a_{11}) ... ... **137)** 225
<<20>> *kvip* (zero$_2$) ... ... **(138-139)** 226-227
<<21>> *vit* (zero$_4$) ... ... **(140)** 228-229
<<22>> *ṇini* (in_1) ... ... **(141-146)** 230-235

B–4. EXTRA-ORDINARY CASES OF TṚJĀDI-ENDING FORMS 236

aṇ (a_5) ... ... **(147)** 236
ṇini (in_1) ... ... **(148)** 236-237
khaś (a_8) ... ... **(149)** 237-238
ṇvul (aka_1) ... ... **(150)** 238-240

A Brief Analysis of the Findings

TYPE I : CASES SHOWING CONTINUITY IN USAGE 243-247
TYPE II : CASES SHOWING LINGUISTIC CHANGE 248-253

PART I

- *Introduction*
- *Plan and Presentation*

INTRODUCTION

Section I. PRINCIPLES

> "Pāṇini and the *Mahābhāṣya* are documents of the first importance for the historical interpretation of old India and of the Sanskrit language, as well as for the history of linguistic science in general. ... Here lies a vast and difficult task before us, which we cannot shirk."
>
> —THIEME, *JAOS* (1956) 76·23 § 56.

(*A*) *The Basis of Ancient Grammars*

(*B*) *Principles of the Grammarians*

(*C*) *Problems in the Study of Evolution*: *Theoretical and Practical*

(A) CURRENT SANSKRIT AS THE BASIS OF GRAMMARS FROM PĀṆINI TO PATAÑJALI

O. INTRODUCTORY

The hope to obtain a picture of the linguistic evolution of Sanskrit from the works of the grammarians of the period from Pāṇini (through Kātyāyana) upto Patañjali (— hereafter: P, Kty and Ptj respectively* —) is based on the presuppositions :

1. that Sanskrit was the means of communication in the ordinary usage during the period ;
2. that it did not remain static over the period;
3. that P had contemporary Sanskrit as the basis of his grammar; and
4. that grammarians that followed him upto Ptj similarly had their own contemporary Sanskrit as the basis of their observations.

These basic suppositions now being widely accepted as settled facts, the time is probably ripe for a a study of the evolution referred to. For, the present position of the linguistic studies of Sanskrit marks a great stride from the challenging position taken by WHITNEY (— of the BENFEYan school —) during 1884-93 when he started a serious attack against the role of the ancient Sanskrit grammarians being faithful and objective recorders of the facts of their contemporary speech. There is nothing unholy, much less unscientific, in undertaking " a thorough and cautious comparison of the entire system of the grammar with the whole recorded language, "[1] or in endeavouring " to explain the grammar from the language, to test in all details, so far as shall be found possible, the reason of Pāṇini's rules "[2]. KIELHORN is in agreement on this point, saying that " the time has arrived when their teaching should be subjected, by a comparison with the actual usage of the language, to a thorough and searching examination."[3] Every such attempt, if undertaken, far from detracting the grammars from their scientific value, can only serve to put them on a firm and solid foundation in the form of an objective estimation. Subsequent studies of LIEBICH, FRANKE and others in the long line have amply testified to the truth in this remark.

---

* Abbreviations used will be found explained in the 'List of Works and Authors under Reference'.

Today, no one entertains the idea that " the study of the Sanskrit language is one thing, and the study of the Hindu science of grammar another and a very different thing; "[4] nor anyone assumes that the subject of the Hindu grammatical science was " a peculiar dialect of Sanskrit, which we may call the grammarians ' Sanskrit, different both from preclassical dialects and from the classical, and standing either between them or beside them in the general history of Indian language ".[4] We do not believe today in " the great discordance between the real Sanskrit and the grammarians' dialect ".[4] — What has been discovered today is this : " The evidence that the language they (i.e. the Sanskrit grammarians upto Pj) deal was a real living spoken language is overwhelming. Rules as to ...... could have no sense if applied to a dead language. "[5] KIELHORN's finding is that " the so-called grammarian's dialect accords in a most curious manner with the language of what Prof. Whitney calls the language of the Brâhmaṇa period ".[6]

1. PĀṆINI'S TIMES

Of P's Sanskrit (Bhāṣā) KEITH says : " Pāṇini has rules which are meaningless for anything but a vernacular, apart from the fact that the term Bhāṣā which he applies to the speech he teaches has the natural sense of a spoken language."[7] The same is believed by BURROW when he says : "To Pāṇini the main source of his work was the living speech of himself and his contemporaries."[8] These are clear-cut statements. To the question how much of our Vedic literature was used by P, KEITH gives the answer : "It is perfectly legitimate to deduce from such facts that Pāṇini's work is eclectic. Where facts had been gathered, it made used of them; where they were not, its use was sporadic."[9] GHATAGE presents the position succinctly thus :[10] "Various attempts are made to suggest the trait of literature which agrees with the Bhāṣā of Pāṇini. On general grounds one can imagine that Pāṇini set aside from his Bhāṣā, the linguistic archaisms of the Veda on the one hand and the popular vulgarisms current among the speech of the uneducated or less educated mass on the other."

---

[1] W. D. WHITNEY, "The Study of Sanskrit Grammar and the Study of Sanskrit", *AmJPh* (1884) 5.292.

[2] W. D. WHITNEY, Introduction, xiv, to *Sanskrit Grammar* (1889), 7th issue, 1950.

[3] Vide his review on WHITNEY's *Roots*, at *IA* (1886) 15.86.

[4] See fn. 1 : pp. 297, 282, 288.

[5] E. J. RAPSON, "In What Degree Was Sanskrit a Spoken Language ?" *JRAS* (1904) p. 443.

[6] Loc, cit., p. 87.

A brief reference may be made here to a few 'incorrect' or un-Pāṇinian expressions used by P himself in some of his rules.[11] Such instances probably stress the fact that the spoken Sanskrit (of a flexible nature) current at the time of P was in a position to influence even the rules of grammar though unconsciously.[12]

2. KĀTYĀYANA'S TIMES

During the centuries that followed, a good many forms and expressions of P's times became obsolete, new expressions arose, while some old ones underwent phonetic, morphological and semantic changes.[13] "Indeed the effect of his grammar began to be apparent only some generations later, for the inherent vitality of the language had carried it forward with the growth of the people."[14]—Among many others, Kty bore witness to this and made them the subject of most of his Vārttika-s. (See below at (B) : 3 : (1) in this Section.) In this respect Kty can be said to be the **product of the times.** He nodoubt many times tried to explain the Sanskrit of his day from the grammar of P itself; but, on the whole, under the garb of corrections and additions that were embodied in his Critique taking the form of 'Notes' (Vārttika-s), he has provided a vast material that can show a much different picture of the language than the one described by P. As MACDONELL puts it[15]: " When Kātyāyana's criticism shows him to differ from Pāṇini, an oversight on the part of the latter is usually to be assumed; but in estimating the extent of such oversights, one should not leave out of account the fact that Kātyāyana lived both later and in a part of India far removed from that of Pāṇini." So, " the interval between Pāṇini and Kātyāyana was long enough. Otherwise such changes in a language cannot be so rapid." [16]

---

[7] *A History of Sanskrit Literature,* 1928, p. 9.

[8] *The Sanskrit Language,* 2nd ed., 1965, p. 50, also p. 44.

[9] "Pāṇini and the Veda", *IC* (1936) 2.745.

[10] *Historical Linguistics and Indo-Aryan Languages,* University of Bombay, 1962, p. 107.

[11] Cf. at 1.4.30, 55; 3.4.60, 64; 4.2.64. Ptj's remark each time on the last three of these is : *ayukto 'yaṁ nirdeśaḥ ... sautro 'yaṁ nirdeśaḥ* (II. 176.20, 177.5, 284.24), also accompanied by a suggestion of the 'correct' form at those places.

[12] See the very illuminating article by Vidhushekhara BHATTACHARYA, "Pāṇini's Grammar and the Influence of Prakrit on Sanskrit", *IL* (1933), 3.157-59. See further the couplet of one grammarian Vardhamāna quoted by Sāyaṇa in *SDS* and reproduced here at fn. 202.

[13] See e.g. R. G. BHANDARKAR, *JBBRAS* (1883-85) 16.266-71 (=*Collected Works* (1929) IV. 264-70); *Early History of the Dekkan,* 2nd ed., 1895, pp. 8f. (=*Collected Works* (1927) III. 14f.).

[14] I. J. S. TARAPOREWALA, *Elements of the Science of Language,* 1951, pp. 431f.

This is the perspective with which we now look at the services rendered by Kty to the science. It does not, as WHITNEY[17] did, understand the work of Kty to have brought to the relief numerous inaccuracies of P's grammar. That was exactly the other extreme than the one from which the Mīmāṁsist Śabara[18] looked at Kty. BHANDARKAR has correctly presented the situation as follows:. "...... even after making allowance for all these considerations, a good many forms taught by Kātyāyana are left which it is impossible to believe Pāṇini did not observe or know, if they existed in the language in his time. Though not infalliable, Pāṇini was not an indifferent grammarian......If so, the only reasonable supposition is that these forms did not exist in the language at the period when he lived." [19]

About the level (" of a higher order ") of Kty's criticism of P, one may be only referred to the estimation given of it by THIEME: " Dignified in style and ripe in method, it seems to be the result of far-advanced studies and continuous. ardent application to the interpretation of the illustrious grammarian, ' the exalted Pāṇini ' of the last *vārttika*."[20]

3. PATAÑJALI'S TIMES

Not only for the spoken nature of Sanskrit at the time of Ptj, but for his authority:being the living usage of the Sanskrit of his times, ample evidence is provided inside *M*. Apart from his direct and indirect references of a varied nature to the peculiarities of contemporary speech[21], there are other mentions made by him that decidedly inform us of the spoken character of Sanskrit in his times as well as the same being the basis of his grammar : thus in a well-known passage from him,[22] there is, according to R. G. BHANDARKAR,[23] "the clearest possible evidence that Sanskrit was the vernacular of holy or respectable Brahmans of Āryāvarta or Northern India, who could speak the language correctly without the study of grammar".

---

[15] Introduction, xv, to *A Sanskrit Grammar for Beginners*, 3rd ed., 1962.

[16] S. C. CHAKRAVARTI, Introduction, 6, to his ed. of the *Kāśikā-vivaraṇa-pañjikā* (*Nyāsa*), Rajshahi, 1924.

[17] "On Recent Studies in Hindu Grammar," *AmJPh* (1893) 14.176.

[18] *"sadvāditvāc ca pāṇiner vacanaṁ pramāṇam, asadvāditvān na kātyāyanasya. asadvādī hi vidyamānam api anupalabhya brūyāt."* — On the *Jaimini-Sūtra*, 10.8.4.

[19] *JBBRAS* 16.273 (= *Collected Works* IV. 272). The point will be discussed further below at C-1:1.0: (i) in this Section.

[20] *P & V*, 97.

[21] See (i) L. RENOU, *Histoire de la langue sanskrite*, 1956, p. 74, fn. 1; (ii) K. B. PATHAK, "The Age of Pāṇini and Sanskrit as a Spoken Language," *ABORI* (1930) 11.59-83.

Pure Sanskrit, thus, was the language of the Śiṣṭa-s (also called Ārya-s) or the educated or cultured people residing in the 'focal area'[24] of Āryāvarta, while "the general language of the middle classes displayed a mixture of Sanskritizing and Prakritizing tendencies."[25] — Kty (1.3.1.12) and Ptj have also referred to forms showing the latter tendency.[25a] It has even been suspected[26] that "the name Patañjali itself bears unmistakable MIA stamp (ñj > ñc); cf. the name Patañcala Kāpya[27]...... ."

A "difference from the norm of Pāṇini" was glaringly seen in many respects.[28] So, when MIA-like or 'incorrect' words had thus made serious inroads in the speech, the task of giving the society a good or correct language had, after Kty, again and all the more so, fallen, this time, upon Ptj.[28a] For, to quote WHITNEY himself, "it is not customary that a language has its proper usages fixed by rule until the danger is distinctly felt of its undergoing corruption."[29] — And, besides recording the linguistic picture of the Sanskrit of his times in the course of his discussions, Ptj, "like a second Vârttikakâra,"[30] has done this job to the admiration of all; so much so, that, of the Muni-traya, a verdict coming from him wielded the highest authority for usage.[31]

Looking to the comparatively small degree of divergence (or comparatively large degree of agreement) between the usage at the time of Kty and the usage at the time of Ptj, it would not be wrong to say with KEITH that "with Patañjali it seems as if he and Kātyāyana were parted by no great interval of time".[32] — Nevertheless, this interval cannot be very short. For, Ptj is found throughout holding Kty with respect although the latter was probably a Southerner,[33] while at the same time Ptj's norm for correct Sanskrit was taken from the Śiṣṭa-s residing in Āryāvarta or the North-Central India. (See fn. 22.) The linguistic situation drawing its standard from the speech of the Indian Midland and at the same time continuing to be respectful towards the Southern Kty should imply a good passage of time after Kty (even if not implying a shifting of the 'focal area' from the South to the North). This finds corroboration from the fact that references are found in *M* to grammarians most of whom flourished after Kty.

---

[22] III. 174. 2-15 on 6.3.109.

[23] *JBBRAS* 16.335f. (= *Collected Works* IV. 583).

[24] Cp. "Focal areas are those areas whose economic, social, or cultural prestige had led to the spread of their linguistic forms into other areas". — Raven I. McDAVID, "Some Social Differences in Pronunciation", Paper 26 from *Readings in Applied English Linguistics*, New York, 2nd ed., 1964 (Ed. Harold B. ALLEN), p. 252.

[25] F. W. THOMAS, *JRAS* (1904), p. 469.

[25a] See fn. 12 and GHATAGE, "Pronunciation of Sanskrit in Clusters with *h*", *ALB* (1961) 25.103-05. Also : S. D. LADDU, "Prakritic Influences Revealed in the Works of Pāṇini, Kātyāyana and Patañjali" (— read at the Fifth Seminar on Prakrit Studies organised by the Gujarat University, Ahmedabad, in March 1973 : *Proceedings* being published).

[26] See Sukumar SEN, "Three Lectures on Middle Indo-Aryan", *JOI* (1962) 11.200; and earlier, WEBER, *IS* (1873) 13.316, fn. 2.

[27] *ŚBr* 14.6.3.1, 7.1 ff. (*BĀrUp* 3.3.1, 7.1).

[28] See GHATAGE, *op. cit.*, 107f.

[28a] See KEITH, *A History*, pp. 10, 17f.

[29] See fn. 2 : p. xiii.

[30] F. KIELHORN, *Kâtyâyana and Patanjali*, 1876, p. 56.

[31] Cp. Kaiy (II. 545 b) : *munidvayāc ca bhāṣyakāraḥ pramāṇataram, adhikalakṣyadarśitvāt* (at *M* on 2.4.26.7); Kaiy (I. 339 b) : *yathottaraṁ hi munitrayasya prāmāṇyam* (at *M* on 1.1.29), on which NBh (l.c.) : *uttarottarasya bahulakṣyadarśitvāt;* also *SK* 222 there, and at 2875 (on 7.3.59) : *sūtramate tu yadyapi viparītaṁ prāptam, tathāpi yathottaraṁ munīnāṁ prāmāṇyam;* and NBh (112 b) at *M* on 3.1.80.

The period from P to Ptj can thus be found to be the golden period for the students of linguistics looking to obtain a history of the Sanskrit language living in ordinary use during the centuries. Rightly has BELVALKAR characterised the period as "the creative stage of the science."[34]

(B) PRINCIPLES OF THE GRAMMARIANS

1. USAGE OF THE CULTURED SOCIETY

A reference of much value and importance is had from Ptj that the science of grammar was not to impose language upon people by fabricating words and expressions. For, words are *nitya*, not comparable with *kārya* objects.[35] It was the convention set up by their users, the speech-community ('Loka') that was the basis for them. Science ('Śāstra') was only the guiding authority, whose function it was to point out such conventions in the interests of the stability of the usage.[36] For, the same idea can be expressed by a variety of words all of which may not necessarily be acceptable to the society.

Whether it is a happy or 'correct' (*sādhu, śāstrānvita*) word or otherwise (*asādhu, apaśabda, aśāstrānvita*) depends upon whether or not its use comes from the Śiṣṭa-s or the cultured section of the society who may or may not have studied grammar, but have received the usage through social heredity

---

[32] See fn. 7 : p. 426. **This could be seen corroborated from** a record presented below, at the beginning of Type II from "A Brief Analysis of the Findings."

[33] From Ptj's famous reference *priyataddhitā dākṣiṇātyāḥ* (I. 8.8f.) on the very first Vt of Kty, and from Kty's possible acquaintance with the countries of South India as suspected from Ptj's expansion (II. 270.3-4) of *'coḍādyartham'* from his Vt 4.1.175.1.

[34] *Systems of Sanskrit Grammar*, 1915, p. 56.

[35] Ptj, I. 7.26—8.1.

[36] See Kty at *Paspaśā* Vt 1, 1.1.1.10, 1.1.44.14, 1.3.1.12; and Ptj at I.8.20-22, 20.11f., II. 74.2.

(*nivāsa*) or as a result of their pious conduct (*ācāra, daivānugraha, svabhāva*). (See fn. 22.) Sometimes it might happen that a word was formed according to the rules of grammar but was not current in the society, it being not accepted or "desired" (*iṣṭa*) by the educated; in such a case it was not to be used but the one that was desired though not strictly backed by grammar. Formal or solemn occasions also demanded a careful avoidance of incorrect speech and pronunciation for which liberty might be taken only informally. (See. fn. 202). Social or cultural acceptance (*Iṣṭi*), thus, was more powerful a factor than mere grammatical or theoretical establishment (*Prāpti*)[37]. "Patañjali was well aware that the organic vitality of popular speech cannot be contained by the rules of the grammarian."[38] — In short, usage (of the cultured) was the base of bases for the grammar. This was the first avowed principle with Kty[39] as well as with Ptj.[40]

2. USAGE OBSERVED OVER : LITERATURE, TIME AND REGION

At the same time one can argue: "it is reasonable to assume that what is current in a given region at a given period among the Śiṣṭas may not have currency elsewhere".[41] This fact was realised by Indian grammarians as early as Kty and Yāska, and it is to their credit that they had so early become conscious of it.[42] — Thus, in the first place, we have reference to the fact of linguistic (morphological) change, found as one answer to the sceptic who does not see the use of certain expressions.[43] Secondly, possibility of the currency of a usage at a different point of time was also indicated.[44] Lastly, it was suggested to undertake a patient and extensive search in the data-collection[45] over the vast (a) literary and (b) geographical spread of the language;[46] for the spheres of most of the usages might be found restricted to particular (a) literary texts or (b) localities.[47]

When we look to studies in the modern times, we find it stated[48] that it is "the cardinal principle of linguistics" that "language must always, and in every analysis, be studied as a part of social process and social activity, and every utterance must be considered and understood within its context of situation."[49] This is almost exactly what Kty and Ptj appear to have discovered in their days, when they are found to point out the exact situation or context as in their times prevailed in the use of particular expressions.

---

[37] Cp. the famous dialogue between a grammarian and a charioteer, *M* I.488. 17-22 (on 2.4.56.1). See KEITH to whom such a situation suggests "a close parallel to modern conditions in England, where an upper educated class sets norm to all those in lower social classes," *A History*, p. 11.

[38] Krishna CHAITANYA, *A New History of Sanskrit Literature*, Bombay, 1962, p. 28.

[39] Cp. his very first *Vārttika* (*Paspaśā*), and Vt 3 on *ŚSū* 2.

[40] Cp. I.8.24f., 11.1f., 366.12f.

[41] S. M. KATRE, "The Influence of Popular Dialects on Sanskrit", *ABORI* (1943) 24.15.

[42] S. M. KATRE, *Introduction to Modern Indian Linguistics*, 1961, pp. 5f. from 1.8.

[43] *Pasaśā*: Vt 3 (*aprayogaḥ, prayogānyatvāt*), and Ptj there (I.9.11-13).

[44] *Paspaśā*: Vt 4 (*aprayukte, dīrghasattravat*).

[45] Ptj I.9.19f; 23-24 (*upaladhau yatnaḥ kriyatām; mahān hi śabdasya prayoga-viṣayaḥ*).

[46] *Paspaśā*: Vt 5 (*sarve deśāntare*), his '*deśa*' covering both, as implied by Ptj.

[47] For (a): Ptj I.9.21-23, 10.1-3. For (b): Ptj I.9.20, 25—10.1, and also *Nir* 2.2. See further Ptj I.73.4-5 (quoted in fn. 344). (See here: K. B. PATHAK, loc. cit., pp. 72-76.) See also Kty 4.1.175.1 (with Ptj II. 270.3-4), 7.3.45.8, and *Nir* 6.9.

[48] R. H. ROBINS, *Ancient and Mediaeval Grammatical Theory in Europe*, London, 1961, pp. 91f.

3. INTERPRETATIVE DEVICES

Having agreed that the ancient Sanskrit grammarians adhered to the most scientific principle of social context or usage, it can be asked : but what of the usage that was acceptable and current in social communication (Iṣṭa-śabda-s or Rūḍhi-śabda-s), but was apparently not derivable or established by the rules of P ?

This was a very crucial point and a delicate question.If an easy explanation for the usage was forthcoming from the rules of P well and good. But what if not?

The situation is generally met by Kty and Ptj in two ways :

(1) In some cases we get from Kty and Ptj explicit statements of the altered usages (— either newly added or, otherwise, broadened, narrowed or completely lost —) on the rules of P. This amounted to modifications of the original rules of P. But if this involved a serious tampering with the text of the sūtra, such liberty was not permissible.[50] For the textual sanctity of the sūtra was to be maintained as much as possible.

(2) The other course was to adjust every usage with the rules of P, and try to establish it by drawing with all ingenuity everything required from the rules themselves.[51] As C. Kunhan RAJA puts it : "When the original text does not satisfy the needs of the changing times, which is a better course ? Is it better to alter the rules every time or is it better re-interpret the old rules, as far as possible, to satisfy the needs of the changed conditions ? A rule is not a rule in itself but as it is interpreted, and there is a possibility of getting the necessary alteration in the rules without changing the word of the original rules...."[52]

This is the way Ptj has mainly adopted. "What counts for Patañjali is to make the system complete and perfect. "[53] In the words of KIELHORN[54] it could be described as follows: " ...... to extend the sphere of the rules of the *Ashṭâdhyâyî*, so as to make them apply where at first sight they would seem to be inapplicable, and to render additional rules unnecessary ...... "[55]

---

[49] Further : "it is the contextual function alone that constitutes and guarantees linguistic meaning," op. cit., 92. The same author quotes (p. 22, fn. 1) J. R. FIRTH as declaring meaning to be "a complex of contextual relations."

[50] Cp. Ptj saying often : *sūtraṁ tarhi bhidyate. yathānyāsam evāstu.*

[51] Cp. the lines from the *Tantra-vārttika* (on 2.3.16) : *sūtreṣv eva hi tat sarvaṁ yad vṛttau yac ca vārttike / sūtraṁ yonir ihārthānāṁ sarvaṁ sūtre pratiṣṭhitam //* Further : the same lines at the beginning of Durgasiṁha's *Kātantra-paribhāṣāsūtra-vṛtti* (vide p. 49 of *Paribhāṣā-saṁgraha*).

[52] *Survey of Sanskrit Literature*, Bombay, 1962, p. 248.

This principle, that naturally led to the adoption of a number of highly intelligent interpretative devices[56] to be applied to the rules of P to secure the *iṣṭa-siddhi*,[57] was good from the points of the student as well as the society who generally want to be guided by some fixed rule that can be respected, a rule at least whose text is not liable to modification with every new development in the usage of the society. In this connection, GHATAGE's words aptly refer to the approaches adopted by the ancient grammarians :

" By the process of additions and reinterpretations, both Kātyāyana and Patañjali have succeeded in extending the scope of Pāṇini's rules so as to cover many recent features of Classical Sanskrit, and some others they refused to sanction as authoritative being not used by the Śiṣṭas. "[58]

Thus, a record of the large number of linguistic variations, to suggest which was the primary object of Kty's work, and to neglect which was not the idea of Ptj's great work, as well as the many instances[59] of the grammarians' open mind to look at the new developments, go to point out the fact of

---

[53] Cf. S. D. JOSHI, in collaboration with J. A. F. ROODBERGEN, p. X from : the Introduction (section 2 : "Reinterpretation versus historical development") to their ed. of *Patañjali's Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya : Avyayībhāvatatpuruṣāhnika*, University of Poona, Poona, 1969.

[54] *IA* (1887) 16. 244.

[55] See also : (i) WHITNEY : "In general, we know that the orthodox method is to consult the facts, and to force Pāṇini's statements by interpretation into an alleged conformity with them." (*GSAI*, 1893, 7. 248) (ii) K. M. K. SARMA : "Patañjali.... confers an unassailable fixity on Pāṇini's authority by establishing his text under certain protective principles (mostly drawn from the text, i.e. the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* itself) which are so comprehensive as to make Pāṇini's work include in itself the explanation of the changes in the past, present and the future of the language. Patañjali has made Pāṇini valid and active for all times....." (From "An Important Aspect of Patañjalian Technique of Interpretation", *IC* (1941) 8.445. (iii) S. P. CHATURVEDI, "Gata Dvisahasrābdī mẽ Saṁskṛt Vyākaraṇ kā Vikās" (in Hindi), *Nāgarī Pracāriṇī Patrikā*, 1944 : pp. 303-09 (= *Sāraswata-Sandarśanam*, Allahabad, 1973, Hindi Section : pp. 43-47).

[56] See : (i) KIELHORN, "Notes on the Mahâbhâshya, 7 : Some Devices of Indian Grammarians", *IA* (1887) 16. 255-57.
(ii) S. K. BELVALKAR, op. cit., 22-25 : "Technical devices used by Pāṇini".
(iii) S. D. LADDU, "The Device of Contiguity as a Key to Interpreting Pāṇini's Rules," *CASS Studies, Number 1*, University of Poona, 1973, pp. 157-71.

[57] Cp. Kaiy (141 b) : *nityānāṁ śabdānaṁ yathākathaṁcid anvākhyānaṁ kartavyam iti manyate.*

[58] Op. cit., p. 106.

[59] Just to one such from Ptj, reference may be made to the discussion on Obsn **51**.

the grammarians' effort on an intelligent reconciliation of :

(1) objective recording of the developing linguistic facts in explicit terms, and,

(2) giving a stable rule to the society, serving as an authority and providing a standard with which to be guided.

(C) PROBLEMS IN THE STUDY OF EVOLUTION

C-1. Theoretical

1. THE INTERPRETATIVE APPROACH

1.0. *Introductory*

The first problem with which we are straightaway faced in the process of building up a faithful picture of the spread of language over the period in hand is to determine the usage for each succeeding stage under study. The problem of determining the usage at the time of Kty is much less difficult. But about the usage of P, scholars are not unanimous in their views. Did the notes of Kty and Ptj mean to refer to that or to something else? Was a usage, that appeared different from the one established by the rules of P and that was noticed by Kty, to be supposed

either (i) as being left out by P a) out of negligence or
b) out of oversight,
or (ii) as being done so out of his ignorance of the usage, being separated from it in time or in region,
or (iii) as being already implied by the rules of P when interpreted in a particular way?

(i) a): To this possibility answer has already been given by BHANDARKAR which aptly stresses the high standard of accuracy and the very minute power of observation (*mahatī sūkṣmekṣikā*) as abundantly evinced by P in his work. (See fn. 19.) To quote G. V. DEVASTHALI: "In the face of this fact is it possible to conceive that Pāṇini......has failed in his task to such an extent as to leave scope for several thousands of supplementary rules......at the hands of a successor?" "The exceptions or options laid down by Kātyāyana, as any one can see quite clearly, are matters of every day life or of common and frequent occurrence in the daily routine, so much so that it is absolutely absurd to think that they remained unobserved by Pāṇini."[60]

b): It is possible, however, that there could still be found a few forms not noticed by P either due to sheer human fallibility i.e. out of definite oversight, or due to some other reason. In that case, Kty's and Ptj's notes can be understood with certitude not as recording a new linguistic development but only as supplying the linguistic material already prevalent earlier.[61]

---

[60] Pp. 54, 55 from: "The Aim of the Vārtikas of Kātyāyana", *Munshi Indological Felicitation Volume* of *BV* (1960-61) vols. 20-21, pp. 52-63.

[61] See e.g. cases at Obsns **22, 23, 25.**

(ii): This is not the position that the preceding observations in fact make us fall upon: the one of immediately assuming that "evolution of language is what prompted Kātyāyana and Patañjali to make their statements."[62]

It is true that with the language living upon the tongues of the society, there was always a possibility of different (or un-Pāṇinian) expressions being used, or of one type of (i.e. Pāṇinian) expressions developing different twists of meaning or different contexts in the course of time or across distant regions. With the factor of the human mind being involved, one form may be found preferred by the educated sector at one time and in one locality, while another one at a different time or in a different locality.[63] Thus, interpreted sheerly from the point of linguistic history, Kaiyaṭa's maxim "*yathottaraṁ munitrayasya prāmāṇyam*" could be properly valid here, with his and Nāgeśa's explanation on it (— see fn. 31 —) clearly pointing out the degrees of validity with the Munitraya (though Kaiyaṭa and Nāgeśa need not be taken to be **opining** that the later two Munis record the successive development in the language of their times).

Yet the assumption of linguistic variation cannot be hazarded easily, in the face of a number of factors complicating the state of ancient Indian literature, such as: 1. the loss of a large section of it, leading to not a few uncertainties in the entire picture, 2. the general inaptitude for historical recordings on the part of the Hindu writers of those days, and, last but not the least, 3. the Hindu attitude of spontaneous and supreme respectfulness unto the standard text from any science[64] and his looking up to it as a sacred stabilizing force (*pratiṣṭhā*) of permanent validity (*sanātana prāmāṇya*)[64a], which naturally resulted into his making it (i) cover solutions to questions of all types and of all times or (ii) yield ideas suited to his types of reasoning, through various kinds of interpretation of the text.[65]

---

[62] Cf. JOSHI and ROODBERGEN, loc. cit., pp. viif.

[63] It is like the rule by democracy where decisions made at one time could be altered by the will of the people at a different time, nothing being final or permanent in it.

[64] Cf. See, for the Dharma-Śāstra and the Alaṅkāra-Śāstra, DASGUPTA, *Lit*, p. xxviii. He attributes it (p. xc) to "a loyalty ingrained deeply in the mental structure of Hindu life" or to the "patternising tendency of Indian Culture."

[64a] Cp. "Pāṇini had no desire to be dictator in matters linguistic. But soon after he had passed away he was considered a "Muni" and this new semi-religious reputation of Pāṇini added to the sacredness of the Veda made the religious brake on the progress of Sanskrit doubly effective."—I. J. S. TARAPOREWALA, *Sanskrit Syntax*, Delhi, 1967, p. 13.

[65] Cp. DASGUPTA, (*Lit*, p. xxvii) : "It is curious, however, to note that though the Indian systems of philosophy diverged so diametrically from one another, they all professed to be loyal interpreters of the Upaniṣads...... It is curious to note that the same Upaniṣad text has been interpreted by some writers as rank nihilism, by others as absolutism and by others again as implying dualism, pluralism or theism." Also see DASGUPTA (*Philos*, I.41) : ".....most schools of Hindu philosophy found it one of their principal duties to interpret the Upaniṣads in order to show that they alone represented the true Vedānta doctrines."

Thus, in full consciousness of these factors and making allowance for them, it is to be admitted that the major struggle in which we are here involved is in critically balancing a) the possibilities of the play of the above factors (alone, to the exclusion of the possibility of P's oversight) on the one hand, and b) the possibilities of seeing records of genuine linguistic development in the early works on grammar on the other hand.

(iii) : This possibility arises chiefly when the rules of P are not clear or definite and make scope for the factors mentioned just above, in which case an effort honestly aimed at understanding the implication of the rule serves to discover the linguistic facts at its basis and becomes scientifically helpful. But it can as well be very intelligently extended to P's rules which are apparently clear but which can be shown to be clearer or complete when interpreted in a particular manner that covers additional forms not normally derivable by the rules in question, in which case, however, the interpreter's activity becomes deceptive and unscientific for understanding the scope of the original rule (though it may **incidentally** help in supplying the new linguistic picture). This refers to the " Interpretative Devices " mentioned above (just up here at ' (ii) ', and earlier as the Third Principle in sub-section '(B)').

It was in some form voiced again recently. Rosane ROCHER favours the view that " both Kāyāyana and, after him, Patañjali, have merely tried to give an even more correct and precise description of the language, *i.e.*, of one and the same Sanskrit language "; and finally avers : "..... it is a most dangerous procedure, to introduce into ancient Hindu grammar a concept which is a purely Western creation, and even more so, a Western creation of a vary recent date. The "diachronic" aspect of the study of language was born in the 19th century; it would be vain to look for it in the ancient grammarians, be they Western or Indian."[66] This statement of a viewpoint, made with such clarity and force, should be considered of historic importance in the line of studies of the Vārttika-s and the *Mahābhāṣya*; and, apart from evoking an equally forceful statement of the other viewpoint (—from G. V. DEVASTHALI: fn. 60 above—), it has been gradually collecting scholars in opposite camps.

This, the position of a kind of reliance on the interpretative approach followed by Kty and Ptj, should lead us into an examination of the nature of ' Interpretation ', of the degree of value that can be attached to it, and of the approach that could be decided upon in our investigation.

---

[66] Vide pp. 261, 268 from : "The Hindu Grammarians and Linguistic Changes", *JOI* (1962) 11.260-68. The discussion follows by making as its basis three Sūtra-s (1.3.25,51,64) which, among others, are taken up by K. M. K. SARMA in his article, "Patañjali and the Linguistic Changes," appearing in *QJMS* (1944) 35.134-42; (1959) 49.263-70 (—the 3 Sūtras in question, at 35.135).

1.1. *Nature of 'Interpretation'*

What is it that constitutes an 'Interpretation'? Attempts at interpreting or understanding the rules of P are made by Kty, and similarly attempts at interpreting the rules of P as well as the notes of Kty are made by Ptj. Thereby both try to discuss such aspects as: (1) the purpose of the rule, (2) the purpose of the use of a word in the rule, (3) the import of a word used in the rule, (4) the purpose of the re-employment of a word that can be contextually understood in the rule, (5) the purpose of the Anubandha attached to a word used in the rule, (6) the scope of a technical term, etc. The service rendered by interpretation, where a rule is not clear or exact in all its aspects (form, sense, accent, force), or where the scope of a rule even if clearly worded does not do justice to to the picture of the language (through its very presence, its over-applicability, its under-applicability, or its total absence), is the obtainment of correct understanding (of the particular aspect/aspects) as intended by the framer of the rule, this being done either by means of supplementary rules framed by the interpreters or by means of their devices interpreting accomodation of the whole development (irrespectively of the lines of its diffusion) within the connotation of the same basic rule.

In general, interpretations could be found to belong to one of the following categories :

1. Far-fetched and unhappy.
2. Doubtful.
3. Possible and helpful.
4. Good, but sometimes also incidentally giving rise to unwanted results.

1.2. *Riskiness Involved*

Basically, thus, this represents a very sound and objective attitude, that of trying to understand an author by making him speak out his own mind behind his writing.[67] It has, however, given rise to some confusions and controversies, as it combines a good principle with the possibities of a bad implementation. For, it is not seldom that, in practice, an interpreter is tempted, consciously or unconsciously, to strain it out of supra-linguistic considerations: and the moment he does that, it ceases to yield objective results, the linguistic facts relevant to his own speech being fathered upon the linguistic scene of the basic rule he is interpreting.

A good instance of this is provided by K. Kunjunni RAJA. Kumārilabhaṭṭa finds fault with Śabara providing illustrations of words as carrying two sets of meanings with two types of speakers; to Kumārila they carried only one set of meanings. RAJA remarks that this shows "that Kumārila did not care to look at the problem from the diachronistic point of view." RAJA "clearly" sees here a semantic change occurred during the passage of time.[68]

---

[67] See THIEME, p. 53 from : "The Interpretation of the Learned" (pp. 47-62), *Felicitation Volume Presented to Prof. S. K. Belvalkar,* Banaras, 1957.

We may now proceed to study the contribution that the Interpretation or *Vyākhyāna* or Commentary (from the early commentators) can make to understanding a factual or objective picture of the language at a previous stage.

1.3. *Value of Vyākhyāna or "(Tradition) of Interpretation"*

The value of a study of the Commentaries on *M* was long back stressed by KIELHORN, and with the least over-estimation, in the following words: ".....no attempt at understanding the true nature of the *Mahâbhâshya* is likely to be successful unless it be based on a careful study of what the Hindu commentators themselves have written about it."[69] THIEME, too observes: "They must be taken seriously as scholars who offer us the quintessence of their deep and precise thinking, who know the subject of their discussion with a thoroughness for which we have every reason to show highest respect, and who master their technique with perfect ease."[70] However, he has a further remark: "We cannot rely on the indigenous commentaries. But we can put them to excellent use."[71] JOSHI–ROODBERGENS' observation underlines the same point: "The opinion of Kaiyaṭa and of Nāgeśa cannot replace an independent judgment on the interpretation of a *Bhāṣya*. But to form such a judgment whatever help can be had from the commentators should be gratefully accepted."[71a] —These statements should serve to give our study the necessary balance: regarding setting up of the point upto which to rely upon the Commentaries and the point or points where they should be approached with an open and questioning mind.

Now, what is true of the Commentaries on *M* can **also** be true of the Notes by Kty and the Comments by Ptj on the Grammar of P,[72] with the only difference that, these latter being far nearer to P in time than the later commentators, their *vyākhyāna* could be much more faithful to the intentions of P. As such, from the point of the truest interpretation of P's rule, not Kaiyaṭa's well-known maxim but a maxim like '*yathāpūrvaṁ*' *munitrayasya prāmāṇyam* should alone prove valid.[72a]

---

[68] Pp. 129f. from: "Diachronistic Linguistics in Ancient India", *JMadUHum* (Centenary No., 1957) 28.127-30.

[69] Concluding remarks of the article, "On the Mahâbhâshya", *IA* (1876) 5.251. His remark there (p. 248) about Nāgeśa may also be noted: ".....a man of Nâgojîbhaṭṭa's vast learning and scholarship, whom I had found cause to regard as one of the greatest commentators of modern times....."

[70] *JAOS* (1956) 76.22.

[71] Loc. cit., p. 18.

[71a] Loc. cit., p. iii.

[72] Cp. also RENOU: "The interpretation of Pāṇini is possible only with the help of commentaries, which does not mean that one should not make special efforts, as difficult as that may be, to get away at times from these commentaries. The oral(?) gloss, contemporary with Pāṇini has not been preserved."—P. 486 of "Pāṇini", *CTL* (1969) 5.481-98.

When P presented his Grammar in a highly condensed but systematic manner, as a true methodologist, mostly at the beginning of his treatise, he explained some of the techniques employed by him in the system. Of the remaining techniques that he used but did not explain, some were probably taken by him as familiar to all the serious students of his time, and some were probably explained by him directly in oral instruction to his own batch of students. These techniques, in some form, were received by Kty, and later by Ptj, through Tradition ('*Vyākhyāna*'), in analysing, discovering and stating which they spent all their ingenuity and vigour, to be able to give a 'true' import of P's rules. The very fact that the two Muni-s were inspired to adopt mainly the Traditional Explanation[72b] introducing Interpretative Devices can be good proof that their object was "to give an even more correct and precise description of……one and the same Sanskrit language." And it is in tune, therefore, that J.C. WRIGHT should have remarked: "In reaffirming Pāṇini's treatment in spite of grave doubts, Kātyāyana and the later commentators were opposing the historical development of the language."[73]

Notwithstanding this, this does not mean that, even where P's rules are broad or ambiguous, one should be guided unquestioningly by the Comments (*Vyākhyāna*) of the Muni-dvaya (Kty and Ptj), even by sometimes being disregardful of the actual, attested usage and of their human fallibility. For want of an unfailing oral transmission, somewhat similar to the one in the case of the Vedic texts[74], that would be far from following an objective line of investigation: of submitting to the (interpretative) mode of the Comments on

---

[72a] Cp. Sukumar SEN: "The first commentator, the author of the Varttika sutras, was perhaps in a better position than the second commentator, the author of the *Mahābhāṣya*, to notice some of the changes in current speech." (*Paninica*, Calcutta Sanskrit College Research Series No. 74, Calcutta, 1970, Preface, p. ix.)

[72b] Cp. Ptj's famous dictum (quoted twelve times by him in *M*) and what is Nāgeśa's very first *Paribhāṣā* in *PŚ*: *vyākhyānato viśeṣapratipattir na hi sandehād alakṣaṇam*, "The precise (meaning of an ambiguous term) is ascertained from interpretation, for (a rule), even though it contain an ambiguous term, must nevertheless teach (something definite)." (—Transl. by KIELHORN, *PŚ*, Part II, 2nd ed., Poona, 1960, p. 2.) Also, RENOU (op. cit., p. 493): "Precaution must be taken with regard to the commentaries which are above all contributions to a tradition even when they seem to innovate."

[73] *BSOAS* (1962) 25.624 (—at the end of a review on *Grammatical Method in Pāṇini* by Betty SCHEFTS).

[74] See fn. 56: (iii): p. 157.

P's speech by Kty far separated in region as well as in time from him, and to the mode of the Comments on P's and Kty's speeches by Ptj, again, separated in time and region from both.

It does not also mean that the "Interpretation" can under no circumstance be suppressing the actual linguistic development within the very sacred textual fixity— a 'textual' fixity and nothing more— of the rule (see fn. 50) which is after all just the shell or the exterior of the rule. There is no good reason why faithful recorders like Kty and Ptj must always be denied (what has been accepted in principle) an intention to record the contemporary linguistic usages, developed or developing but current in their times, though perforce by submitting to the sentiment or the philosophy of the contemporarary society to which 'Śabda' "Text" was almost 'Brahman' "the Highest Principle", but by effortfully discovering the way-out of Devices to intepret the fixed text of P's rule so as to convey the linguistic features detected anew and even peculiar to the times. Thus, acceptance of their variously pregnant interpretations each time just at face value and understanding them as just 'real' interpretations (i.e. either as ones intended by P or as being valid for P's times alone) exhibits, on the part of the modern student, a kind of credulous attitude towards these interpretations, and can even afford ground (though unworthily) for a variety of 'interpretation' put up on his own preparedness for a look deeper and more objective than that of the ancient interpreters, be they Western or Indian.

1.4. '*Interpretation of the Interpretation*'

The study is given a correct perspective by JOSHI-ROODBERGEN when they say : " The question is not whether a development of Sanskrit has taken place after Pāṇini, but whether we can ascertain such a development from the statements made by Kātyāyana and Patañjali and from Patañjali's examples " and "...... we are used to looking at Kātyāyana through Patañjali's eyes. "[75] It is, however, unfortunate that the authors have not followed up their own line further deep in their otherwise very fine presentation of the whole case. As a result, by clinging to the thread of possible oversight on the part of P, they felt compelled to reject the thesis of evolution " on purely theoretical grounds. "[76] This is, in the least, labour lost and thought cut down half-way, let it be hoped, temporarily.[76a]

---

[75] Loc. cit., pp. viii and ii. They were kind to take note, in the discussion, of the present thesis in its earlier and unpublished form.

[76] Loc. cit., p. X.

[76a] Happily Rosane ROCHER has recently come forward with a candid line of her having been initially "guilty of overstatement." (Vide her review of JOSHI-ROODBERGEN, op. cit., *IIJ* (1973) 15.138.) This should augur well for a further progress in the discussion.

To restate matters, there are, as we now know, no two opinions on :

1. the fact of the living, and hence growing, organism that the Sanskrit language was during the entire period of the Munitraya;
2. the fact of the actual usage in speech having been most respected by them and been made the basis of their treatment of the language; and
3. the fact that, being mostly innocent of the historical concept, their records try to fit in most of the new developments within the original rule of P by applying to it various devices of interpretation.

Acceptance of these basal facts lends to our study the only direction of 'interpreting the interpretations' of Kty and Ptj. The same weapon of interpretation as employed by the two sages, if cautiously turned upon themselves, is capable of producing useful results. Without, however, "introducing" (— in the sense of presupposing —) the historical concept into (i.e. as being the under-current of) their statements, as R. ROCHER feared, the history-innocent and interpretation-inclined Muni-dvaya could be struggled with and made to allow us a glimpse into the realities of the linguistic state of their times. At the same time, the student has to be fully conscious, at every move during the struggle, of the hydra-headed complexities involved. Neither is the ground clear, nor the sky, whichever instance from the *Laukika* we choose : the hare of linguistic variation that runs through the bush of interpretative comments, or the fugitive sun through the cloudy sky, can be caught only by our employing certain effective measures or devices. It is thus only with a special effort directed along accepted lines of research that the possibility of evolution through the works of Kty and Ptj can be explored with a degree of exactitude. This is introducing an approach **into our examination** of the records of the ancient Hindu grammarians rather than **into their minds.**

The **tests** that can be applied (even if a little imperfectly), to know whether a scholar-commentator in his interpretation of an earlier work is studying the implications objectively or not, can be :

1. attestation of the form in early or contemporary literature;
2. the usual style, habit and vocabulary of the scholar found pursued in his comments; and
3. common or uncommon nature of the form even in the subsequent phases of literature.

These could be tapped as throwing some useful light on the intentions of the author(s) under study in which each case is, as far as possible, taken up singl y and independently for examination.

2. ATTESTATION

2. 0. Obviously this can be an easy and effective check on the interpretation i. e. on the material obtained or assumed thereby. In many cases non-attestation of the derived forms is also found helpful in determining the general usage at a period;[77] while in some cases even anticipation of a form can be made from a different syntactical construction,[78] affording some light on the development of the usage.

The **linguistic sources** that can be tapped for our purpose would be the Vedic literature (especially its later strata), other early literature that could be vaguely contemporaneous with the period of the authors under study viz. the Munitraya, and the vocabulary of the Munitraya itself.

2. 1. *Situation of Non-derivation of Forms by P*

The questions that confront the enquiry at the outset are :

1. What can attestation of a form from the Vedic literature which is not noted by P but is pointed out by Kty signify ?

—The answer can be that that portion of the Vedic literature (V_2) was not known or utilised by P, either (*1a*) as it belonged to the latest strata of the Veda that was composed after P, or (*1b*) as it belonged to that text of the Veda that was peculiar to a region far distant from P.

2. What can non-attestation of a form in the early literature, which is not noted by P but is noticed by Kty, mean ?

— The answer can be either (*2a*) that the form developed after P, or (*2b*) that it belonged to that early literature (E_2) which was different from the one known or used by P (E_1), (*2b′*) this being valid even in the regional context, in both the cases the source utilised by Kty being lost to us.

3. What can non-attestation of a form from the Vedic literature, which is not noticed by P but is perhaps referred to by Kty, imply ?

—The answer can be that it could have belonged to the part of the Vedic literature (V_3) that was lost to P and is lost to us as well.

The suggestion contained in nos. *2* and *3* of the loss of literature was ridiculed by WHITNEY.[79] Even then the suspicion is not brushed aside. As early as centuries before Christ, Ptj was confronted with the vast mass of Sanskrit literature and he has given a clear expression to that. No one needs to be told of the long subsequent history of political and cultural onslaughts on Indian life, and naturally on Indian literature too[80], running over about twenty centuries. As such Ptj's admonition (—see fn. 45 —) directed to the sceptic of the days to curb rashness and undertake an honest and tireless search for more data, or at least to accept the limitations imposed by the current state of our knowledge, is much more valid to-day, apart from its general unassailability on scientific grounds.

---

[77] Cf. In Obsns **30, 31, 85, 139, 141.**

[78] Cf. In Obsns **83, 131, 144** and in fns. 281, 363, 400a, 502a, 514, 588a.

[79] "Of course, for the absence in the language of words or forms specified in the rules it is always possible for a partizan of the native grammar to bring up the excuse that such words occurred in the texts that are not preserved to us. . . ." *GSAI* (1893) 7.250. Compare also DASGUPTA (*Lit,* p. xxiii) on the creation of the legal fiction by the Hindus.

Thus, very appropriately J. GONDA observes : " A serious source of errors inherent in any linguistic research directed on an ancient literature whatever its scope and elements is the element of chance. How are we to know whether a word or a form which is rare or frequent in the texts was also rare or frequent in contemporaneous usage ? " [80a]

In this connection the remark by Laurence URDANG is applicable with great justification to the ancient literature of India : " 'The lack or absence of evidence can never be used as a proof '. In other words, since our documentation of a language is never complete, we can never be sure that a particular word does not have a particular usage or history."[81]

2.2. *Implied Forms*

Attestation relates to the forms which appear to be implied as well as to those which are derived directly and/ or recorded. Value to be attached to the former depends largely upon literary evidence, again making allowance for the loss of some literature.

Even then the implied usage may not always be correct i.e. intended by the author of the statement. The possibility of such a counter-usage (*pratyudāharaṇa*) based on the statements of the Munitraya (— which has been abundantly illustrated in *KV* and to some extent in *M* —) arises from acceptance of a complete (i.e. a negative or *vyatireka*-type as well as a positive or *anvyaya*-type) correlation between a form stated in the rule and the context or the sphere of application to which it is limited or conditioned in the same rule. It is even possible that such a complete or one-to-one correspondence between the two was not always intended by the grammarian; he may have had the idea just to state one type (say, a positive-type) of correspondence and stop there.

---

[80] Attention can be drawn to Ptj's references to pieces of classical literature of his times even which are lost to us.

[80a] *Old Indian*, Leiden-Köln, 1971, p. 6 (and fn. 3, for the loss of Vedic literature).

[81] *Lg* (1963) 39.588, from his review on *Problems in Lexicography*, ed. HOUSEHOLDER and SAPORTA.

One test to prove or disprove the possibility of a counter-usage is to search for the actual evidence of that usage. **Another test** is the general style of the author of the statement.

2.3. *Chronological Difficulties*

The next difficulty in attestation of a form in early literature, with a view to fixing the historical order of its usage, is that of dating the early literature like the Āraṇyaka-s, the Upaniṣad-s, the Śrauta-, Gṛhya- and Dharma-Sūtra-s, the Darśana-Sūtra-s, the Epics, the *Nirukta, Manu-Smṛti, Kauṭilīya Artha-śāstra* etc. This sometimes causes vagueness in the conclusions that might be reached, which cannot be helped.

2·4. *Lack of Critical Texts*

There is the further difficulty of uncertainty of the genuine nature especially of the texts ancillary to the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, such as the *Gaṇa-pāṭha, Dhātu-pāṭha* and *Uṇādi-Sūtra*, which makes us not sure of the constituent items in their entirety under each.

It will, however, be found, in the study that follows, that, in general, most of these reference tools (including the own vocabulary of the Munitraya) have been drawn upon as a **guideline** and a **check** in the discussions; and that has proved to be of much benefit.

3. DIRECTIONS OF VARIATION

One more problem of importance is that of wading our way through the mixing up of the historical and geographical forces behind the evolution. (An element of borrowing as from the Dravidian family of languages cannot also be ruled out. [81a]) The two get inextricably mixed when the texts being dealt with go back to antiquity. An ideal study in evolution is expected to throw light on both these factors, termed by EMENEAU[82] as "linguistic evolution" and " linguistic diffusion " respectively. As Kamil ZVELEBIL[83] remarks, " Both diffusion and evolution should be taken into account, just as it is, according to our conviction, not only possible but sometimes necessary to combine fruitfully the synchronic and diachronic approaches within a single major investigation and description. "

[81a] Cf. The writings of BURROW (op. cit., Ch. VIII : "Non-Aryan Influence on Sanskrit", etc.), KUIPER and others.

[82] See Introduction to his paper, "Diffusion and Evolution in Comparative Linguistics," from *Dravidian and Indian Linguistics*, 1962.

[83] *IIJ* (1964) 7.325, in his review on the work of EMENEAU (cited at fn. 82).

Beyond stray references to the regional peculiarities, made by P in some of his rules,[83a] and by Kty, Ptj and Yāska (—see fns. 33, 47 (b), and 344—), we are in the dark about the working of the geographical factor in the linguistic facts recorded by Kty and Ptj. However, in the discussion that follows suspicion is recorded on meeting with such spots during the study.[84]

This is not all, however. Form-peculiarities could also point to other facets of usage : They might sometimes be " artificial innovations " being either the " results of poetic license ", [84a] or else a mark of intelligence on the part of a precocious student which is merely a part of grammarians ' theorising (— see below under C-2 : 1V : 2 : (ix)—). They could also reflect developments which have to be regarded " as events of socio-linguistic order " [84b] including those peculiar to the ritual setting. [84c]

In fine, attention is drawn also to the possibility of discreteness in the course of linguistic evolution (referred to hereunder at fn. 143).

C-2. Practical or Special

It is intended to refer to these rather *diṅmātram* : by indicating the most common problems met with during the study and giving an idea of the solutions offered to meet some of them.

(*Note* : One-reference figures in bold type refer to the Observations from the study that follows.)

I. WITH PĀṆINI

(Not deriving the forms.)

1. All the forms that are attested in the earlier i. e. Vedic literature are not derived by him. [85]

[83a] See Sukumar SEN, *Paninica,* Calcutta, 1970, pp. 12-15.

[84] See Obsns **53, 71, 72, 80, 95 ,98, 132, 138.**

[84a] Cf. GONDA, op. cit., pp. 11 (where fn. 5 for other references), 17; also RENOU at fn. 72, p. 498, and "Grammaire et poétique en sanskrit", *Études védiques et pāṇinéennes* (1961) 8.105-31.

[84b] Cf. GONDA, op. cit., pp. 13, 17.

[84c] Cf. RENOU at fn. 72, p. 498, and "Les connexions entre le rituel et la grammaire en sanskrit", (1941-42) 233.105-65. Also, STAAL : "Indeed, the existence of the Sanskrit grammatical tradition would be wholly unintelligible without the equally unparalleled background of the Vedic ritual." — P. 432 from *A Reader on the Sanskrit Grammarians,* the M.I.T. Press (*Studies in Linguistics*) Series No. 1, 1972. Witness P's Sūtra-s 3.1.127-132, and especially remarks here under Obsn **49** and fn. 202.

[85] For forms attested in the Veda but apparently not derived or incompletely derived by P, see S. D. LADDU, "Vedic Forms and Pāṇini—A Glance", *Ṛṣikalpanyāsa* or *Pt Rajeshwarshastri Dravid Feli. Vol.* Allahabad, 1971, English Sec. : pp. 54-69.

—The reason may be

either (i) that the particular text was not known to him as it belonged to a different (eastern) region (cf. 71 *śaṁbhava-*, 77 *giriśa-*, 95 *avatāna-*, 136 *anyādṛś -*),

or (ii) that he lived before the composition of that text (cf. 131 *gurutalpaga-*, 137 *anyādṛśa-*),

or (iii) that the form did not much occur in his usage [cf. 7 *aryá-*, 15 *°hatyā́-*, 25 *kṛṣṭapacyá-*, 36 *kuṇḍapā́yya -*, 38 *agnicityā́-*, 49 *upacāyyapṛḍa-*('gold' sense), 55 *samajyā-* (location sense), 93 *nilimpa-*, 95 *tana-*, *avatāna-*, 111 *dārvāghāṭa-*, 130 *suga-*, *durga-*, 132 *brahmajya-*, 133 *subhagaṁkaraṇī-*, 135 *dadhṛṣ-*, 143 *brahmavādin-*('well-doing' sense)],

or (iv) that he derived the (Primary) form in a peculiar manner not correctly understood by us (44 *bhāryā-*, 132 *prahva-* from *pra-* √*hvṛ-* + *ḍa*),

or (v) that he forgot to note the form [cf. 15 *°hatyā́-*, 19 *ājya-*, 21 *saṁbhārya-*(adj), 22 *sūrya-* (force), 23 *avyathya-* (force), 27 *samavasṛjya-*, 31 *adābhya-*, 92 *vyāghra-*, 130 *suga-*, *durga-*, (also enumerated by him :) 84 *kumuda-*, 64 *nadī-*],

or (vi) that he derived it only as a Secondary form (cf. 2 *vāstavya-*, 5 *vadhya-*, 77 *giriśa-*, 79 *deva-* , 136 *anyādṛś-* 137 *anyādṛśa-*),

or (vii) that he treated them as Unanalysable (*avyutpanna*) forms (cf. 79 *meṣa-*, 136 *anyādṛś-*, 137 *anyādṛśa-*).

2. Sometimes even a form enumerated by him in the sūtra elsewhere in the body of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* is left underived (cf. 66 *bhava-*, *śarva-*, and, also with its sense :92 *vyāghra-*).

— The reason can be

either (i) that he forgot to derive it,

or (ii) that, rarely, such a form-type (cf. *pādapa-*) though used by him cannot be said to be in frequent use at his time (as in 82 *kacchapa-*).

2′. Sometimes simple forms are left underived by him (cf. 30 *lāpya-*).

(Not noting the sense.)

3. Sometimes he does not note the obvious sense of the form. The reason may be

either (i) that he forgot to do that (cf. 8 *ajarya-*, 22 *sūrya-*, 25 *kṛṣṭapacya-*, 38 *agnicityā-*), or (ii) that he did not use the form in that sense (cf. **24** ***kupya-*, 81** *°stha-* forms, **143** ***brahmavādin-***).

4. His sūtra-s are of **wide application** in a varying degree.
(Wide: cf. 3.1.97, 98, 110, 124, 125; 3.2.14, 15, 68, 77, 78, 80;
Widest: cf. 3.1.96, 134; 3.2.1; 6.3.14.)

—In that case, a form can be suspected to be in P's usage,

(i) if the form or the form-type (recorded by Kty or Ptj) is very simple (cf. **10** *lavya-*, *pavya-*, **13** *ceya-*, **14** *gamya-*, **56** *kāraka-*, *hāraka-*, *yājaka-*, *pācaka-*, **61** *āsitṛ-*, *śayitṛ-*);

(ii) if it is attested in the Veda (cf. **140** *āmād-*);

(iii) more certainly so, if, in addition to its being simple, its attestation is available in the Veda (and perhaps in later literature also) or in his own vocabulary (cf. **3** ***cetavya-***, **12** ***meya-***, **21** ***saṁbhṛtya-***, **56** ***adhyāyaka-***, **59** ***lāvaka-***);

(iv) possibly so, if the root at the base of the root-form (i.e. the free Kṛdanta) is found used in his own vocabulary (cf. **27** ***sṛjya-***, **32** ***lāvya-***, ***pāvya-***, **46** ***gopya-***, **80** ***budha-***, ***bhida-***, ***yudha-***,***siva-***);

(v) also possibly so, but not quite, if, in the case of the obligatory (Upapada-) compound, either its nominal component or the root component or even each of them is attested in the Veda or / and in his own vocabulary or in some of his ancillary treatises (cf. **15** *śva*-hatyā*, *dasyu*-hatyā-*, **73** *pārśva*-śaya-*, **124** *kukṣi*-ṁ-bhari-* [*these elements occurring in the Veda also], **28** *pāṇi-sṛjya-*, **40** *śva-ghātya-*, **52** *tṛṇopendhya-*, **67** *śakti-graha* etc., **68** *sūtra-graha-*, **85** *śaṁ-stha-*, **87** *sugla-*, *sumla-*, **106** *kāṇḍa-lāva-*, **107** *grāma-ṇāya-*).

5. Whether a **condition laid down** (in the locative case) for the use of a form refers to its sense-context or to its syntactical context. (Cf. In 3.1.103 *aryaḥ svāmi-vaiśyayoḥ*, whether *svāmin-* and *vaiśya-* are supposed to be the meanings for *arya-* [and, conversely, *brāhmaṇa-* to be that for *ārya-*], or to be the substantives qualified by *arya-* [and, conversely, *brāhmaṇa-* by *ārya-*].)

6. Were the **C (ounter-) F (ormation) s** (many times supplied by Ptj, but by others also) intended by P or not?

—Probably so,

(i) where in P's derivation the original form was associated with some condition (cf. **7** ***ārya-****, **11** ***āneya-***, **12** ***meya-***, ***niceya-***, **59** ***prāvaka-****, ***sāraka-****, ***lāvaka-**** (* these not being supplied by Ptj), **78** ***ajara-***);

(ii) where, in addition the CF was a simple form of much currency in literature or perhaps was found used or derived by P elsewhere.

7. It is not known definitely, though it is not unlikely, that, where **more-than-one form-conditions** are stated in a rule, P intends stress on all these (—giving rise to so many respective CFs). Interpretations in this regard are suggested sometimes by Kty (on 4.2.13, 6.2.148) and by Ptj (on 3.2.87, 6.1.81 twice, 6.4.135, 7.3.86), for which see II. 10 below.

8. It is not known for certain that, in the case of the extraordinary, ready-made formations (**Nipātana-s**) supplied by P, the extraordinary factor present in his mind was not just one at a time, but of any number as was understood in the traditional school. (Cf. **24** ***kupya-***, and the five accentuation cases: **7** *arya-*, **25** ***kṛṣṭapacya-***, **36** ***kuṇḍapāyya-***, **38** *agnicityā-*, **135** *dadhṛṣ-*.)

—See in this connection **fn. 545.**

9. Indefinite **composition** of his **Ākṛti-Gaṇa-s.**

—We cannot be sure here that their member forms could be taken as intended by him

(i) where they are not derivable by his rules (cf. **66** *bhavá-*, *śarva-*, **79** *meṣa-*, *deva-*, *seva-*), or

(ii) even when they are attested elsewhere (cf. **64** *corī-*, **65** *jārabharā-*, *śvapacā-*). (See no. 5 from II below.)

10. **Exact scope of the Anuvṛtti** as intended by P is not clear. (Cf. that of ***upasarge*** from 3.1.136 in 3.1.137: see fn. 353; that of ***anupasargāt*** from 3.1.138 and of ***vibhāṣā*** from 3.1.139, both in 3.1.140: see Obsn **95.**) Even Kty is sometimes not sure of it and feels like re-reading it (cf. ***anupasarge*** of 3.1.100 at 3.1.106: see fn. 164).

II. WITH KĀTYĀYANA

1. **Authoritive nature** of some of his Vārttika-s is doubtful. (Cf. In the present study: 3.2.83.1 which is [later] rejected as a Vārttika by KIELHORN, for which see fn. 510; 3.1.96.1 on which see fn. 114; and 3.2.55.1.) But discussion on these is kept out of the study here.

2. The nature of his Notes is sometime **wide** in differing degrees. (Wide: cf. 3.1.106.1; 3.2.1.2, 3, 7, 8; 3.2.3.1; 3.2.4.1; 3.2.38.1; 3.2.49.3; 3.2.61.1; 3.2.78.1; Widest: cf. 3.1.96.1; 3.1.134.1; 3.2.8.2.)

—We can here apply the check of attestation of the form in early literature like the Veda, Epics etc. and in his own vocabulary. (Cf. **56, 57** etc.)

3 His express restriction of a rule to the Veda '**chandasi**' at times (cf. 3.2.15.4,5 on *giriśa*-) is puzzling as to how a widely attested and well-known form was not current in his usage.

4. Sometimes his Note, though not restricted to the Veda, either (1) gives the suspicion that it is valid only for a Vedic usage (cf. **7** *arya-* 3.1.103 1; **25** *kṛṣṭapacaya-* 3.1.114.3; **36** *kuṇḍapāyya-* 3.1.130.1; **38** *agnicityā-* 3.1.132.1; **135** *dadhṛṣ-* 3.2.59.1), (2) or evokes only a Vedic illustration from Ptj (cf. **21** *sambhārya-* 3.1.112.4; **25** *kṛṣṭapacya-* 3.1,114.3; **41** *ācārya-* 3.1.100.1;? : **43** *vārya-* 3 1.109.1; **93** *nilimpa-* 3.1.138.1; **111** *dārvaghāṭa-* 3.2.49.1; **138** *-vediṣad-*, *duroṇasad-* 3.2.61.1; **143** *brahmavādin-* 3.2.78.2.)

—As, however, Kty is usually very particular in small details and ordinarily does not fail to issue restriction of his note to the Veda (cf. 3. 1. 108. 1; 3. 1 118. 1; 3. 2. 1. 9; 3. 2. 8 2; 3 2. 15. 4), it would be in fairness to him to understand the above notes as establishing forms appearing in the Veda as well as in the usage current at his time.

5. We do not sometime know how best to make use of his Note (cf. 3. 1. 134. 2) in the absence of an exact knowledge of the composition of an Ākṛti-Gaṇa. (Cf. Did he refer to *corī,-nadī-*, *jārabharā-* and *śvapacā-* ? Did he, again, include *meṣa-*, *deva-*,*seva* - in that *pacādi-gaṇa* ? — See no. 6 from I above.)

6. We do not know for certain that the forms he understood under the cover of **'ādi'** were the same as, or not less or not more than, those supplied by Ptj. (Cf. 3. 1. 133.3 and 3.2 1. 1; 3. 1. 135. 1, 2; 3, 2. 5. 2; 3. 2. 15. 1. 3; 2. 1 33.2.)

7. We cannot be sure that the **CFs** supplied by Ptj were intended by him (Kty) or not.

   (i) We can sometimes say that they were, possibly. (Cf. 3. 1. 105. 1: *ajaritṛ-* **61** and *ajara-* **78**; 3. 1. 108. 1: *dasyuhátyā-*, *śvahátyā-***15**; 3. 1. 114. 2 : *gopya-* **46**; 3. 1. 114. 3 : *kṛṣṭapākya-* **47**; 3 1. 118. 1: *pratigrāhya-*, *apigrāhya-* **26**; 3. 2. 5. 1: *tundaparimārja-*, *śokāpanoda-* **108**; 3.2.8.1: *kṣīrapā-*, *surāpā-* etc. **90**, **113**; 3.2.9.2 : *sūtragrāha-* **109**.)

   (ii) ......that they were, probably. (Cf. 3.1.100.1 : *ācārya-* **41**; 3.1.109.1 : *vārya-* **43**; 3.1.112.2 : *bhārya-* **44**.)

8. Some CFs not supplied by Ptj on his Notes can be supplied by us and examined (Cf. 3.1.137.1 : *vijighra-*, *vyājighra-*, *jighra-*, *ghrāya* **92**; 3.1.138.1: **lipa-*, **vilipa-* **93**; 3.1.138.2 : **goveda-* **94**; 3.1.149.1 : **prāvaka-*, *sāraka-*, *lāvaka-* **59**, 3 2 14.1 : *śamkarī-* **122**; 3.2.15.4 : *giriśaya-* **77**; 3.2.21.1 : *kimkarī-* **120**; 3.2.24.1 : *stambakāra-*, *śakṛtkāra-* **123**; 3.2.49.1 : *dārvāghāta* **111**.)

9. It needs to be carefully examined whether his Note intends a special stress on the **form-condition** (cf.3.1.135.1) or is merely a record of the fact of the form-condition (cf. 3.1.138.1): i.e. whether his note is conditioning (and sometimes corrective) or merely declarative.

10. Sometimes, for the establishment of a form operation of one or **more conditions** are suggested in the rule by Kty. Where stress on these is obviously intended (cf. 3. 1. 138. 2; 3. 2. 15. 4; 3. 2. 49. 1; also, as pointed out by Ptj, 6.1.28.1), it is to be seen whether it is to be effective on all or on only a few (unspecified) of the form-conditions. The phrase '*ubhayataḥ* (*niyamaḥ*)' "(restriction) bothways" is found some-times used by Kty (cf. 4. 2. 13. 1; 6. 2. 148. 2), and, independently, also by Ptj (cf. I. 46. 4, 121. 16f., II. 112. 11, III. 28. 10, 54. 12, 224. 9f.). (See in this connection **fn. 322** for the differing implications.)

11. Rarely, we meet with some **vagueness in his intention** to derive a particular usage or not. —Cf. (i) **93** *nilimpa-* as a name can be derived in 3.1.138.1 only by drawing the qualification '*saṁjñāyām*' from his next Vārttika on the strength of the '*ca*' from the latter. (ii) **82** *kacchapa-* etc. are derived only incidentally by the first half of 3.2.4, when the *sūtra* is read with a *Yoga-vibhāga* suggested by him at 3.2.4.2 with a totally different object declared earlier by him at 3.2.4.1.

While in the first case here we have a definite ground of its Vedic attestation, in the second case we are on an uncertain ground.

III. WITH 'APARA'

1. **Wide** nature of some of the rules noted as from 'Apara' (cf. on Kty's Notes on 3. 2. 48).

IV. WITH PATAÑJALI

1. **His attitude towards a Vārttika** is expressed in varying degrees:
   (i) Although he is silent after having supplied an illustration on Kty's Note, his non-dissention with the Note can be taken to indicate that the usage detected by Kty was acceptable to the society of his time also.
   (ii) His supplying a connected usage for the illustration, or a number of examples, or a CF, indicates increased possibility of the currency of the form in his days.

2. **His examples** are the principal basis in all discussions about fixing the usage for his or for Kty's times. But his attitude in their supply is **of a varied nature.** Thus:
   (i) The general suffix *-elima* is not illustrated as appearing after vowel-ending roots.
   (ii) CFs are not always supplied (cf. at 3.1.103.1; 3.1.137.1; 3.1.138.1,2; 3.1.149.1; 3.2.5.1; 3.2.14.1; 3.2.15.4; 3.2.16; 3.2.21.1; 3.2.24.1; 3.2.49.1; 3.2.53).

(iii) No secular example is produced although Kty's rule does not refer to the Veda (cf. at 3.1.112.4; 3.1.114.3; 3.2.15.4; 3.2 49.1; 3.2.61.1). —This suggests that such forms were not much current then.

(iv) Only *sopasarga* examples are sometimes given (cf. *apalāpya-* and *avadābhya-* at 3.1 124.3; *uṣṭrapraṇāya-* at 3.2.1.3; *sukhapratīkṣa-* at 3.2.1.7; *ākhūttha-* etc. at 3.2.4.1).

(v) Confusing illustrations are sometimes supplied (cf. at 3.2.78.1 : Obsn **142**).

(vi) Few examples are supplied in some cases. (Cf. on his extension as *kṛto bahulam* of the irregularity-rule 3.3.113 *kṛtya-lyuṭo bahulam*; of -(*ṁ*) *-manya-* forms at 3.2.83.)

(vii) Saṁjñā examples are not suggested at 3.2.8.2.

(viii) Not a connected but **short usage** is supplied sometimes (cf. on 3.1.103.1; 3.2.13.1; 3.2.24.1).

(ix) It is not clear sometimes whether discussion on the forms carries merely a theoretical value giving the so-called "grammarians' examples". (Cf. **104** *mahākumbhakāra-*, **134** *anāḍhyambhaviṣṇu-*, **146** *śrāddhabhojin-*.)

3. **Corruption in his text** is suspected at places (cf. II. 91.10f., 100.19, for which see fns. 263 and 319 respectively), and some variant readings also need to be considered or noted (cf. **30** *avalāpya-*, **66** *śava-*, *sava-*, **126** *khariṁ-dhama-*, *°dhaya-*, **58**, **96** *vāyaka-*).

Section II. GRAMMAR

(*A*) *The Section of Grammar Selected*
(*B*) *Principles Underlying Derivation*
(*C*) *Processes of Primary Formation*
(*D*) *About the Suffixes Treated*

(A) THE SECTION OF GRAMMAR SELECTED FOR STUDY

> "………within the Indo-Aryan setting it will be interesting to see how the nominal stem-formants have developed ……… it would be interesting to see how these (verbal) bases lent themselves in point of time to the nominal formantia which gave rise to the huge vocabularies of Old and Middle Indo-Aryan." "……… it will be interesting to compare the productivity in the course of historical evolution, for just as vocables are capable of being preserved in inherited forms or replaced by new vocables, so also these suffixes are capable of being inherited or replaced by newer suffixes. The measure of change and its venue when determinable, will prove of immense value to the progress of historical linguistics."

In these words the importance of a study of the evolution of the primary and the secondary formations was underlined by KATRE a quarter of a century ago.[86]

It is the development of the "Primary Formations" (Kṛdanta-s) whose study has been undertaken here.

(B) PRINCIPLES UNDERLYING DERIVATION

An "Instruction on Words" (*Śabdānuśāsana*), that P's grammar is, implies the teaching of the formation of words i. e. of their derivation. As most of the substantives in a living language show a root at their base, nominal derivation can generally mean an analysis into the root and the suffix(es).

This principle of analysis can be stretched to the extreme, by attempting to derive every substantive from a root. But an unpedantic and objective recorder of facts is able to detect that, inside the living organism of a language, certain expressions for some reason enjoy the high tide of popularity at a certain period in history and in a certain locality, while the same expressions at another period or in another locality suffer from a much less use or even total disuse. Further, a conscious use of certain expressions means consciousness of or aliveness to the various sense-components signified by the respective morphemic components from these expressions : and this an ordinary user may not always be able to display. Expressions noted to be used significantly only by a sister speech-community, as well as expressions that, by a long and accepted social habit, have, in the same speech-community, come to be used without much attention to the individual significance of their components, may be said, to the minds of the particular speech-community, to be opaque, frozen or solidified expressions, as they do not easily yield to an analysis into components which by that time have turned meaningless or have lost their individual significatory power. What these expressions have retained in the social mind is only their total significance (which is now only **one** entity) that is little faithful to their original **collective** significance.[87a] These are called Rūḍhi-śabda-s or words that have found a footing in the usage on the strength of social convention. (One well-known variety of such words is the Saṁjñā-śabda-s or proper nouns that had orginally taken their nomenclature from the attributes or possessed peculiarities by the objects signified and expressed by the different components of the terms.)

---

[86] As Wilson Philological Lecturer (Bombay University) in 1941. See *Some Problems of Historical Linguistics in Indo-Aryan*, 1944, pp. 103, 111.

It can be seen that it would be sheer doctrinairism to compel looking for the same analysis in such expressions. It would be a still more serious betrayal of the same attitude if one tried the process of analysis on such hard expressions as are not generally understood to be possessing any meaningful ingredient at all.[87b]

But scholars are generally divided. The etymologists (Nairukta-s) and one grammarian, Śākaṭāyana, proclaimed adherence to this extreme principle of word-analysis; while the grammarians and one etymologist, Gārgya, displayed a sober and rational attitude.[88]

P shows his greatness in accepting in principle the theory of analysis into a root and a suffix (— by agreeing to incorporate the **whole** of the section of these Uṇ-ādi suffixes seeking to derive the hard forms, in one Sūtra, ***uṇādayo bahulam*** 3.3.1, from the Kṛdanta section, by using the word '*ādi*' " etc. " after '***uṇ***' —); but he shows still more greatness in refusing to side with an extreme and indiscriminate application of this theory (— by dismissing these suffixes with the brand of irregularity or Bāhulya —).[89]

Where, however, the significant element (primarily the root) in a word was clearly visible or recognisable to its users, that word was to be analysed according to the method of grammar.[90] This logically involved derivation with the help of a suffix which must be the element assisting the root to bring out the total significance conveyed by the word. This technique sometimes required the grammarian to set up a zero suffix-element which, when attached to the root, gave the word its meaning, in case the Kṛdanta form agreed in toto with the root-form[91a]. (Cf. *dviṣ-* "one who hates, an enemy" = √*dviṣ-* "to hate + a zero-suffix in the sense of agent.") [91b] This is perfectly logical.[91c] Not only that; this zero-suffix need not be looked upon as a (theoretical and imagined) product of the grammarian's craving for maintaining the order of the logic or the consistency of presentation; it appears as if to have been subconsciously **used** by the user of the word.

[87a] See Jinendrabuddhi : *rūḍhiśabdeṣu nāvayavārthena bhavitavyam. kiṁ tarhi ? samudāyārthena.* (*Ny* 585 on 3.2.60.)

[87b] See NBh (215 b) on Śl-Vt at 3.3.1 : *sarvābhyaḥ prakṛtibhyaḥ tattadrūpeṇa vidhānaṁ tu brahmaṇāpi durupapādam.*

[88] *Nir* 1.12-14, 2.1; and the well-known Kārikā-s quoted by Ptj on 3.3.1.

[89] See J. S. PADE, Introduction (p. ix) to the *Tāmbūlmañjarī*, Baroda, 1958.

[90] See George CARDONA, Review on *Phiṭsūtras of Śāntanava* by G. V. DEVASTHALI, *JOI* (1968) 17.332-35.

(C) PROCESES OF SPRIMARY FORMATION

1. FORMATION

According to P's linguistic analysis, all full words (Pada-s) fall into two categories:

(1) Verbal (or Conjugated, Tiṅanta) words,
(2) Nominal or Substantival (or Declined, Subanta) words.

These are formed by the addition of a suffix or post-position (Pratyaya) which invariably follows a base (3.1.1,2).

A Tiṅ-anta or a conjugated word is formed from a verbal stem called a 'root' or Dhātu (1.3.1, 3.1.32) followed by the verbal suffix or Tiṅ (3 4.78). —A Sub-anta, a (fully or partially) declined word, is formed from a nominal stem called a Prātipadika (with or without the addition of a feminine suffix) followed by the nominal suffix or *sup* (4.1.1,2).

Thus, 'Dhātu', 'Prātipadika' (the two types of stems) and 'Pratyaya' are the ultimate (or 'smallest recurring' meaningful units[92] to which an analysis of full words leads a student of P.

A Prātipadika (1.2 45) not only excludes a suffix (*a-pratyaya*) but is to be supposed also to exclude what ends in a suffix (*a-pratyayānta*, by the maxim at 1.1 72). Important exceptions to this latter type of exclusion are the Kṛdanta-s and Taddhitānta-s or the two types of formations formed with the addition of primary and secondary suffixes respectively (1.2.46). A compound is also a Prātipadika.

Thus, a Prātipadika or a declinable stem can be either a Kṛdanta, a Taddhitānta, a Samāsa, or an *avyutpanna* ("unanalysable") base.

[91a] "the distinction between the noun and the verb being neutralised" : see V. V. IVANOV and V. N. TOPOROV, *Sanskrit*, 'Nauka' Publishing House, Moscow, 1968, p. 103.

[91b] See (i) MACDONELL, Introduction (p. xi) to *A Sanskrit Grammar for Beginners*, Reprint 1962; (ii) W. S. ALLEN, "Zero and Pāṇini", *IL* (1953) 16.106-113; (iii) M. D. PANDIT, "Zero in Pāṇini", *JMSU* Baroda (1962) 11.53-66.

[91c] Narendra Chandra NATH, however, brands this as an "unwanted presumption"; vide his *Pāṇinian Interpretation of the Sanskrit Language* (B. H. University, Varanasi, 1969), p. 51f.

[92] Cp. on 1.2.45 : *arthavac-chabdarūpa* (*KV*), °*svarūpa* (*SK*).

Starting the other way — i.e. synthetically[93] — from a Dhātu (1.3.1, 3.1.32), *dhātoḥ* 3.1.91, we find only two kinds of suffixes that can be attached to it[94].

(1) Tiṅ which, when added, gives a Tiṅanta;
(2) Kṛt which, when added, gives a Kṛdanta.

Hence, a Kṛt is defined negatively as being other than a Tiṅ (*kṛd a-tiṅ* 3.1.93).[95] — A Tiṅ is a substitute (3.4.77,78) for *l* (*a*)[96] which, however, is a Kṛt (2.4.81.8, 3.2.124.8).

2. DIVISION

(a) The Kṛt suffixes are broadly divided into two sections, the first of which is termed the Kṛtya "to-be-done"[97] and extends over the Sūtra-s 3.1.96-132. The second one is generally referred to as the *Tṛj-ādi* section[98] as it begins with a rule containing the suffix *tṛc*; it extends over the Sutra-s 3.1.133-3.4.76.[99] From the second section, however, are probably to be omitted suffixes (like ***tumun***) denoting 'verbal action' (for which see fn. 104).

(b) Another division of forms derived with these suffixes that overlaps the above one is between the Declinables and the Adverbs[100] or Indeclinables.[101] The Indeclinables are the infinitives and absolutives formed with the suffixes, *-tum* ***-am*** and *-tvā* (alternating with *-ya*). They make a small section by the end of the whole treatment (3.4.9-66, and also, 3.3.10, 158, 167).

3. FORCES

(a) As a general rule, a Kṛt[102] is said to carry the agent sense (***kartari kṛt*** 3.4.67). Important exceptions to this rule are:

---

[93] See S. D. Joshi, *Patañjali's Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya : Samarthāhnika*, University of Poona, Poona, 1968, pp. x-xi; especially : "Thus Pāṇini's analytical method combines these two different approaches, namely the ultimate form as the starting point of description (*vibhajya anvākhyānam*) and the same form as the final stage of generation (*krameṇa anvākhyānam*)." (p. xi.)

[94] Cp. Ptj. : *dhātor hi dvaye pratyayā vidhīyante : tiṅaś ca, kṛtaś ca* (I.467. 5f., III.135. 12f.).

[95] Although Tiṅ was not defined earlier.

[96] See *KV* (i) On 3.4.69 (p. 242) : *la iti utsṛṣṭānubandhaṁ sāmānyaṁ gṛhyate; prathamā-bahuvacanāntaṁ caitat;* and (ii) On 3.4.77 (p. 243) : *akāra uccāraṇārthaḥ.*

[97] Itself a potential passive participle (Kṛtya) from √*kṛ-* with *kyap* (3.1.120).

[98] First by Kty at 3.1.133.3, 3.2.146.3, 3.3.10.1, and 1.4.2.3.

[99] On this division, see (i) R. S. BHATTACHARYA, "Some Anomalies in the Aṣṭādhyāyī and their Justifications", *BV* (1956) 15.118f.; and (ii) S. D. LADDU, "The Sphere of Reference of the Technical Term *Tṛjādi* According to Kātyāyana and Patañjali," *JUP* (1968) 29.1-10.

[100] *'avyaya-kṛtaḥ'* of Ptj (II.171.16, 175.20).

[101] Even the "indeclinables", being Prātipadika-s, are first followed by nominal case-suffixes (Sup-s), which are only later dropped by 2.4.82.

[102] Itself a Kṛdanta from √*kṛ-* with *kvip* (—by 3.2.178.1 according to Kty and Ptj, but by 3.1.76 according to *KV*).

- (i) The Kṛtya-s that are generally used (3.4.70) either in the objective or in the impersonal (action) sense (derived either from a transitive or from an intransitive root respectively). Only a few extraordinary cases (Nipātana-s) that are alternatively used also in the agent sense are recorded in the end (3.4.68).
- (ii) A group of the Tṛjādi suffixes that denote either the action sense[103] or the sense of a non-agent action instrument (3.3.18-130).
- (iii) The group of suffixes forming Indeclinables (3.4.9-66) that show the action sense.[104]
- (iv) A miscellaneous group at the fag-end of the whole section (3.4.70-76).

(b) By way of an exception, P had detected irregularity or diversity either in the formation or in the significance of the Kṛtya and *lyuṭ* suffixes (*kṛtya-lyuto bahulam* 3.3.113). (Ptj, however, saw the same extended to suffixes from the entire Kṛt section : *kṛto bahulam iti vaktavyam* II. 155. 12.)

(c) Certain rules of P make a special reference to some of the very common senses in which the Kṛtya-s and a few other suffixes are used.

1. Thus, Kṛtya-s are said to carry the senses of :
   - (i) direction, (ii) permission and (iii) the proper time (*praiṣātisargaprāptakāleṣu kṛtyāś ca* 3. 3. 163),
   - (iv) the time after a *muhūrta* (*liṅ cordhvamauhūrtike* 3. 3. 164),
   - (v) fitness (of the agent) (*arhe kṛtya-tṛcaś ca* 3. 3. 169),
   - (vi) necessity and obligation ((*āvaśyakādhamarṇyayoḥ*) *kṛtyāś ca* 3. 3. 171), and
   - (vii) capability (*śaki liṅ ca* 3. 3. 172).
2. It will be found that *tṛc* (*-tṛ*$_1$) is already referred to as possessing the sense of fitness (of the agent). (*arhe kṛtya-trcaś ca* 3. 3. 169.)
3. The suffix *ṇini* (*-in*$_1$) also is mentioned to posses the senses of necessity and obligation. (*āvaśyakādhamarṇyayor ṇiniḥ* 3. 3. 170.)

4. AN IMPORTANT CHARACTERISTIC

A chief characteristic of the primary and secondary formations (as well as of compound formations) has been indicated by Kty, as being dependnce on their significatory power, in other words, on their actual usage. ('*abhidhāna-lakṣaṇa-tvāt pratyayasya*' from 3. 3. 19. 3.) The reference intended by Kty by the word 'Pratyaya' was brought about by Ptj (*abhidhāna-lakṣaṇāḥ kṛt-taddhita-samāsāḥ*. II. 146.7). The importance of this observation becomes apparent when we are furnished with another observation of Kty whereby even grammatically correct or possible formations are denied sanction when they were found to be not current in the usage. (Cp. *anabhidhānāt* 3. 2. 1. 5 and at many other places; so too Ptj. thereon and at II. 146. 7 again. [105]

---

[103] This is Ptj's '*dravyavat bhāva*' or one that is *bāhya* to the *prakṛti*(=*dhātu*)-*artha*. See the next footnote.

[104] Cp. Ptj's *avyayakṛto bhāve bhavanti*, II.171.16, 175.20f.—This is Ptj's '*kriyāvat bhāva*', and is probably similar to the *tiṅ-abhihita bhāva* which is (the *svārtha* of or) *ābhyantara* to the *prakṛti*(=*dhātu*)-*artha*.—(i) For these two types of Bhāva-s among the Kṛt-s, see Ptj : *kṛd-abhihito bhāvo dravyavad bhavati, kriyāvad api bhavati*. II. 4.33.9f. : also respectively called '*siddhāvastha*' and '*sādhyāvastha*'; vide *SK* 3185 (3.3.18) and *TattvaB* (p. 579) on *SK* 3320(3.4.21). (ii) For the distinction between *kṛd-abhihita bhāva* and *tiṅ-abhihita bhāva*, see II. 57.4-17. (iii) For Bhāva being *bāhya* or *ābhyantara*, see II. 145.16-17, 177.19-20.

5. POSSIBILITY OF ALTERNATIVE USAGE OF FORMS WITH DIFFERENT SUFFIXES

P seems to have observed in usage currency of some types of Kṛdanta-s that were derived form the same root but that carried different (*a-sarūpa*) suffixes in their efficient form (though bearing a similar force); but not forms showing the root taking a similar efficient suffix (though differing, by the artificial technique of grammar, merely in the *Upadeśa*-forms i.e. by showing different indicatory letters).

To illustrate, he seems to have come across a simultaneous use of forms like *vikṣepaka-* and *vikṣeptṛ-*" scatterer " (formed with the general suffixes *ṇvul* and *tṛc* respectively by 3.1.133), as well as a form like *vikṣipa-* " scatterer " (formed with the exception suffix *ka*, by 3.1.135), which last, according to the technique of grammar, was actually to supplant the two previous forms. — However, he probably saw the use of a form like *go-da-* " cow-giver " (formed with the exception suffix, *ka* i.e. a_2, by 3.2.3), but not a form like **go-dāya-* "cow-giver" (formed with the general suffix, *aṇ* i.e. a_5, by 3.2.1.). Here the latter form was supplanted by the former by the usual (*para-balīyastva*) technique of grammar, as in this case the effiicient form of the suffix, *a*, was the same, not *a-sarūpa*, in both the cases.

Observation of such usages made P frame the important rule, *vā ' sarūpo 'striyām* (3.1.94).

There are some general and special restrictions (placed probably by the usage of the times) on the extent of the application of this principle, into which it is not thought necessary to enter here.

6. RULES ABOUT COMPOUNDING

1. A Kṛdanta may occur singly in a Vākya, after being a Subanta (4. 1. 1, 2). Otherwise, if compounded, its compounding as a final member is sanctioned by

---

[105] On Anabhidhāna, see (i) KIELHORN, "Some Devices of Indian Grammarians", *IA* (1887) 16.245f.; (ii) JOSHI-ROODBERGEN, (fn. 53 above:) p. vii; and (the commentaries:) (iii) *PdM* 541 : *tac ca anabhidhānaṁ yatrāptair uktaṁ tatraiva aṇyatra tu yathālakṣaṇaṁ bhavaty eva; tathā ca paṭhati 'yathālakṣaṇaṁ aprayukte' iti;* (iv) *anabhidhānabrahmāstram āśritya pratyākhyānaṁ tu nātīva manoramam* (—quoted only as from *ŚabK* by R. S. BHATTACHARYA at *JGJRI* (1951-52) 9.174, fn. 8, and located for me by Alekha Chandra SARANGI therein as on the Sūtra 1.4.31, p. 120).

the rules, ***ku-gati-prādayaḥ*** (2. 2. 18), ***upapadam atiṅ*** (2. 2. 19) and the three following rules (2. 2. 20-22), all of which fall under the sphere of the Tatpuruṣa compound (2. 1. 22-2. 2. 22). Not only that; Compounding by 2. 2. 18-20 is made obligatory by the Adhikāra of '*nityam*' in force from 2. 2. 17, while compounding by 2.2.21,22 is optional.

A Kṛdanta being formed out of a root, can be preceded by an Upasarga i.e. a Gati. A Gati and an Upapada Kāraka are to be invariably compounded with the following Kṛdanta (by 2.2.18,19).

2. What this 'Upapada' could be has been informed by P as being a form technically quoted in the locative case *tatra=upapadaṁ saptamī-stham* 3.1.92). But in the same section P has used the locative also with other functions like expressing the force or significance of a form or a suffix. So the use of the locative particularly for an Upapada is to be understood from the context.[106]

3. Further, all Upapada-s are not quoted by P in the locative, but some in the etymological sense of this term (*upoccāri padam* "a contiguously uttered or adjacent word"): e.g. at 1.3.16.71; 1.4.105, 106 These are not compounded.— But also not all of the technical Upapada-s are compounded: e g. 3.3.10-13, 157, 158, 167, 175; 3.4.13, 18, 24. That means that some of the technical Upapada-s are used by P also in the etymological sense of the term of "an adjacent word."

4. An Upapada can be
   (i) a Tiṅanta : e.g. 1.4.106; 3.3.10-13, 157, 158; 3.4.12, 65;
   (ii) an adverbial Subanta : e.g. 1.3.71; 3.3.112, 185; 3.4.18, 24, 27, 28, 30, 59, 64 etc.;
   (iii) a nominal Subanta : e.g. 1.3.16, 1.4.105; 3.3.167, 3.4·13; 3.2.1 and a host others from the section

5. Return may be made now to the rule of compounding mentioned in the beginning.

Interpretation of the word '*atiṅ*' from P's rules, ***upapadam atiṅ***, and probably the need to sanction some old or new forms not easily derivable by the rules of P, made the early grammarians, Kty and Ptj, frame the maxim, *gatikārakopapadānāṁ kṛdbhiḥ saha samāsa-vacanaṁ* (*prāk subutpatteḥ*), 4.1.48.4.

By this, the Gati, Kāraka and Upapada Subanta-s were to be (— or, could be —) compounded with a Kṛdanta even **before** the latter became a Subanta. This constituted an exception to P's general rule for compounding, that of a Subanta with a Subanta (2.1.1-4).[107]

---

[106] See THIEME, *P & V*, 25, n.1, as well as his quotation from NBh : *tad-vyavasthā tu lakṣyānurodhenaiva=iti bodhyam* (*Laghu-śabdendu-śekhara* 3.1.92).

[107] See the Vārttika-s and *M* at 2.2.18, 19, and maxim no. 75 from *PŚ*. See also the studies by FADDEGON (*Studies in Pāṇini's Grammar*, Amsterdam, 1936, pp. 29 f., 33) and THIEME (*P & V*, 24-26).

Beyond stating this it is not thought necessary here to go into the merits of the Paribhāṣā. It might only be mentioned that the invariably (*nityam*) compounding relation[108] of a particular Kṛdanta with a particular single Upapada or a type of it, has made us suggest the possibility of looking at the root itself as bound up with its Upapada (–type), and of this 'compound-root' then taking the Kṛt suffix.[109] This ultimately boils down to saying that the particular Kṛdanta here is a bound morpheme (— into which the compound cannot be dissolved —) in relation to its particular Upapada (sometimes of a particular type).

(D) ABOUT THE SUFFIXES TREATED

The portion of the Kṛdanta section covered for purposes of the present study comprises the notes and observations of Kty and Ptj on the Sūtra–s 3.1.91–3.2.83 of P. Pertinent from the historical point, from this portion, are those suffixes and forms that are discussed by Kty and Ptj. An enumeration and analysis of these suffixes, together with a reference to the elements conveying their significances, has been presented below.

1. SUFFIXES

(1) *List of Suffixes in the Sūtra–Bhāṣya Order*

(Column 1 shows the suffix in its efficient form, followed within single brackets by the same in its Upadeśa–(enjoined)–form i.e. along with its indicatory or eliding (*it*) letters. Suffixes not commented upon are put within double brackets. —The numbering of the varieties of the same efficient suffix (showing different Upadeśa–forms) is done according to the order in which they occur in the Sūtra–s, although (even) its (first) occurrence may have gone uncommented in the Bhāṣya.

Column 2 shows the Sūtra (or Vt) where it occurs.

Column 3 shows the totally uncommented Sūtra where it occurs.

A star (*) placed on the Sūtra-number indicates enumeration of Nipātana(–s) in the Sūtra.)

-elima (*kelimar*)	3.1.96.1	
-tavya$_1$ (*tavyat*)	3 1.96	
((*-tavya*$_2$)) (*tavya*)	3.1.96	
((*-anīya*)) *anīyar*)	3.1.96	
-ya$_1$ (*yat*)	3.1.97, 100, 103*, 105*, 106	3.1.98, 99, 101*, 102*, 104*

---

[108] The 'Nitya-samāsa' is defined by Ptj as "one which cannot be dissolved into (its) components" (*yasya vigraho nāsti*, I.418.13).

[109] See discussion on Obsn **99**, especially fn. 396, there.

-ya$_2$ (*kyap*)	3.1.106-09, 111, 112, 114*, 118, 122*, 123*	3.1.110, 113, 115*, 116*, 117*, 119, 120, 121*
-ya$_3$ (*ṇyat*)	3.1.124, 125, 127*, 129*, 130*, 131*, 132*,	3.1.126, 128*
-aka$_1$ (*ṇvul*)	3.1.133	
-tṛ$_1$ (*tṛc*)	3.1.133	
((*-ana*$_1$)) (*lyu*)	3.1.134	
-a$_1$ (*ac*)	3.1.134, 3.2.9-15	
-a$_2$ (*ka*)	3.1.135, 3.2.3-5, 77	3.1.136, 144, 3.2.6, 7
-a$_3$ (*śa*)	3.1.137, 138	3.1.139
-a$_4$ (*ṇa*)	3.1.140	3.1.139, 141-43
-aka$_2$ (*ṣvun*)	3.1.145	
((*-thaka*)) (*thakan*)		3.1.146
((*-ana*$_2$)) (*ṇyuṭ*)		3.1.147, 148
-aka$_3$ (*vun*)	3.1.149	3.1.150
-a$_5$ (*aṇ*)	3.2.1	3.2.2, 44
-a$_6$ (*ṭak*)	3.2.8, 52, 53, 55*	3.2.54
-a$_7$ (*ṭa*)	3.2.16, 21	3.2. 17-20, 22, 23
ı (*in*)	3.2.24, 26*	3.2.25, 27
-a$_8$ (*khaś*)	3 2.28-30, 83	3.2.31-36, 37*
-a$_9$ (*khac*)	3.2.38	3.2.39-47
-a$_{10}$ (*ḍa*)	3.2.48, 49	3.2.50
-ana$_3$ (*khyun*)	3.2 56	
-iṣṇu (*khiṣṇuc*)	3.2.57	
((*-uka*$_1$)) (*khukañ*)	3.2.57	
zero$_1$ (*kvin*)	3.2.59*, 60	
-a$_{11}$ (*kañ*)	3.2.60	
-zero$_2$ (*kvip*)	3.2.61,77	3.2.76
((zero$_3$)) (*ṇvi*)		3.2.62-64
((*-ana*$_4$)) (*ñyuṭ*)		3.2.65-66
-zero$_4$ (*viṭ*)	3.2.68,69	3.2.67
((*-a*$_{12}$)) (*kap*)		3.2.70
-zero$_5$ (*ṇvin*)	3.2.71	3.2.72
((-zero$_6$)) (*vic*)		3.2.73
((*-man*)) (*manin*)		3.2.74, 75
((*-van*$_1$)) (*kvanip*)		3.2.74, 75
((*-van*$_2$)) (*vanip*)		3.2.74, 75
-in$_1$ (*ṇini*)	3.2.78	3.1.134, 3.2.51

(2) *List of Commented Suffixes in the Alphabetical Order*

(a) Along with the eliding letters :—

(Single brackets following the suffix enclose its efficient form, the principle of its numbering being the same as stated in *List 1*.

Column 2 records the number of commented Sūtra-s in which it occurs.

The use of the star, as earlier.)

ac ($-a_1$)	3.1.134, 3.2.9–15
aṇ ($-a_5$)	3.2.1
in ($-i_1$)	3.224, 26*
ka ($-a_2$)	3.1.135, 3.2.3–5, 77
kañ ($-a_{11}$)	3.2.60
kelimar (*-elima*)	3.1.96. 1
kyap ($-ya_2$)	3.1.106–09, 111, 112, 114*, 118, 122*, 123*
kvin ($-\text{zero}_1$)	3.2.59*, 60
kvip ($-\text{zero}_2$)	3.2.61, 77
khac ($-a_9$)	3.2.38
khaś ($-a_8$)	3.2.28-30, 83
khiṣṇuc (*-iṣṇu*)	3.2.57
khyun ($-ana_3$)	3.2.56
ṭa ($-a_7$)	3.2.16, 21
ṭak ($-a_6$)	3.2.8, 52, 53, 55*
ḍa ($-a_{10}$)	3.2.48, 49
ṇa ($-a_4$)	3.1.140
ṇini ($-in_1$)	3.2.78
ṇyat ($-ya_3$)	3.1.124, 125, 127*, 129*, 130*, 131*, 132*
ṇvin(zero_5)	3.2.71
ṇvul ($-aka_1$)	3.1.133
tavyat ($-tavya_1$)	3.1.96
tṛc ($-tṛ_1$)	3.1.133
yat ($-ya_1$)	3.1.97, 100, 103*, 105*, 106
viṭ ($-\text{zero}_4$)	3.2.68, 69
vun ($-aka_3$)	3.1.149
śa ($-a_3$)	3.1.137, 138
ṣvun ($-aka_2$)	3.1.145

(b) In their efficient form (with its numbering and the use of the star, as stated earlier) :—

–zero :	$-\text{zero}_1$=*kvin*			3.2.59*, 60
	$-\text{zero}_2$=*kvip*			3.2.61, 77
	$-\text{zero}_4$=*viṭ*			3.2.68, 69
	$-\text{zero}_5$=*ṇvin*			3.2.71
-a :	$-a_1$	=	*ac*	3.1.134, 3.2.9–15
	$-a_2$	=	*ka*	3.1.135, 3.2.3–5, 77
	$-a_3$	=	*śa*	3.1.137, 138

		-a$_4$	=	*ṇa*	3 1.140
		-a$_5$	=	*aṇ*	3.2.1.
		-a$_6$	=	*ṭak*	3.2.8, 52, 53, 55*
		-a$_7$	=	*ṭa*	3.2.16, 21
		-a$_8$	=	*khaś*	3.2.28–30,83
		-a$_9$	=	*khac*	3.2.38
		-a$_{10}$	=	*ḍa*	3.2.48, 49
		-a$_{11}$	=	*kañ*	3.2.60
-aka	:	*-aka*$_1$	=	*ṇvul*	3.1.133
		-aka$_2$	=	*ṣvun*	3.1.145
		-aka$_3$	=	*vun*	3.1.149
-ana	:	*-ana*$_3$	=	*khyun*	3.2.56
-i	:	*-i*$_1$	=	*in*	3.2.24, 26*
-in	:	*-in*$_1$	=	*ṇini*	3.2.78
-iṣṇu	:		=	*khiṣṇuc*	3.2.57
*-elima**	:		=	*kelimar*	3.1.96.1
*-tavya**	:	*-tavya*$_1$	=	*tavyat*	3.1.96
-tṛ	:	*-tṛ*$_1$	=	*tṛc*	3.1.133
-ya	:	*-ya*$_1$	=	*yat*	3.1.97, 100, 103*, 105* 106
		-ya$_2$	=	*kyap*	3.1.106–109, 111, 112, 114*, 118, 122*, 123*
		-ya$_3$	=	*ṇyat*	3.1 124, 125, 127*, 129*, 130*, 131*, 132*

(**Note.* 1. *-elima* has been suspected by RENOU to be a combination of *-el* (*a*) and *-ima*[110a] of which, further, the latter is taken by BURROW as a compound suffix.[110b]

2. *-tavya* is thought by MACDONELL to be actually a combination of the Vedic suffix *-tave* (from the dative sg. of stems ending in *-tu*) and the secondary suffix, *-ya*.[111]

2. INDICATORY LETTERS FROM COMMENTED SŪTRA-S

i : *ṇini*
k : *ka, kañ, kelimar, kyap, kvin, kvip, ṭak*
kh : *khac, khaś, khiṣṇuc, khyun*

[110a] Pp. 25 f. from "Le suffixe *-ima-* en sanskrit", *Festschrift M. Winternitz*, Leipzig, 1933, pp. 18-28.

[110b] See fn. 8 ; p. 175.

[111] (i) *A Vedic Grammar for Students* (Oxford, 1966), p. 255, fn. 1; (ii) *A Sanskrit Grammar for Beginners* (1962), p. 160, fns. 1, 2.

***c* : *ac, khac, khiṣṇuc, tṛc*
ñ : *kañ*
ṭ : *ṭa, ṭak, viṭ*
***ḍ* : *ḍa*
***ṇ* : *ṇa, ṇini, ṇyat, ṇvin, ṇvul*
t : *ṇyat, tavyat. yat*
n : *in, kvin, khyun, ṇvin, vun, ṣvun*
p : *kyap, kvip*
r : *kelimar*
l : *ṇvul*
ś : *khaś, śa*
ṣ : *ṣvun*

[**Note* : *c, ḍ* and *ṇ* are sought to be added by Kty, respectively to *kyap* (3.1.108.1), *khac* (3.2.38.3) and *tavyat* (3.1.96.2).]

Without going into the forces indicated by each of these, it may suffice to refer to the fact that the important item of accent is indicated by as many as seven indicatory letters (viz. *c, ñ, t, n, p, r, l*).

PLAN AND PRESENTATION

(*A*) *Scope of the Study*
(*B*) *General Lines of Study*
(*C*) *Procedural Explanation*
(*D*) *List of Works and Authors under Reference*
(*with Abbreviations and Editions where necessary*)

(A) SCOPE OF THE STUDY

As has been noted earlier, attention in the present study is devoted to an examination

(i) of 143 rules of P, giving in part the treatment of Primary Formations in the Third Chapter of his Grammar (3.1.91 – 3.2.83), 69 of them being discussed in *M*, besides occasionally of the rules referring to the semasiology etc. of particular forms or suffixes, placed at the end of the Third and Fourth Quarters of the Chapter (3.3,3.4);

(ii) of 135 notes of Kty discussing the rules of P; and

(iii) of the criticisms and observation of Ptj thereon.

(B) GENERAL LINES OF STUDY

(1) THE TEXT

1. The edition of *M* that was used as the basis was the second edition in 3 volumes critically edited by KIELHORN. Occasionally, reference was made to the third edition of the first 2 volumes published by the B.O.R.I., Poona (ed. K.V. ABHYANKAR, respectively in 1962 and 1965); that of the 3rd volume (pub. 1972) was not ready then.
2. Attention was given to the variant readings supplied by KIELHORN and to the readings of the Benaras edition supplied by K.V. ABHYANKAR.
3. Kṛdanta forms established by the rules extending upto 3.2.83 being the basis of the present study, forms seeming to fall in this section but actually established by other rules are left out of consideration. (Thus, *ādhyībhavitṛ-* will be found discussed, but not *anāhantṛ-*; similarly are excluded, *kumāra-ghātin-* and *ākhu-han-*: see 3.2.84.4 and Kaiy and NBh (178) there.)
4. All the Kṛdanta forms that are taken up by Ptj for illustration in the Kṛt section are discussed. (Thus, forms like *bhṛtya-* or *ārya-*, not having received special comments there that can throw light on the linguistic history, but occurring elsewhere in the Bhāṣya, are omitted from discussion.)

5. Kṛdanta-s occurring as illustrations in this section are, as far as possible, also pursued inside other parts of *M*, to provide an idea of the frequency of their occurrence in the usage of Ptj.
6. Vedic forms described in the rules were considered as relevant for study, so far as they were found on an examination to be (even indirectly) throwing a light on the usage of the times studied.

(2) NATURE OF LITERARY ATTESTATION

1. Attestation from these reference works, was generally limited to 'early' literature such as the Veda, the Sūtra literature (*Gṛhya*, *Śrauta*, *Dharma*), *Nighaṇṭu*, *Nirukta*, *Rāmāyaṇa*, *Mahābhārata*, *Manu-smṛti* and *Kauṭilīya Arthaśāstra*.
2. For the purpose in hand, attention was focussed **not** on **exhausting** testimony from the early texts (especially of the Veda) — much less that from the classical texts—, but on referring to usages from some and chiefly early texts. It is hoped that no occurrence of significance has escaped notice
3. Excluded from reference chiefly were records from such pieces as the *Bhaṭṭi-kāvya*, avowedly displaying a penchant for artificial use of grammatical forms, and from lexical works.
4. By the very nature of the available reference works (— possibly with the only important exceptions of (i) GRASSMANN's *Wörterbuch zum Rigveda*, 1872, (ii) the *Uttarapadasūci* from the Index Vol. (*V*) to the edition of the *Ṛgveda Saṁhitā* by the Vaidika Saṁśodhana Maṇḍala, Poona, 1951. and the *VWC Consolidated Indices*: *Ab Ultimo*, 1965 —), referential work about forms (used as constituents of compounds) has become limited to their occurrence in the initial position. Through the works mentioned, referencing was possible in the case of Vedic literature to forms occurring in the compound-final position.
5. Sometimes a form has not been supplied with its exact location, —within a literary text if it is of frequent occurrence therein, or within P's rules as it can be got by referring to the Word-Index to his Rules.

(C) PROCEDURAL EXPLANATION

1. For facility of reference to the text (i.e. *M*), discussion is presented mainly in the order of the Sūtra-s, and there too in the order of the Vārttika-s on the Sūtra. (Cf. the order of Observations 1 and 2 in relation to the Vārttika-s 1 and 2 on 3.1.96, even though the suffix at 3.1.96.1 is not recorded in 3.1.96).
2. Order of a commented Sūtra where a suffix makes its first appearance is maintained in the discussion. This is followed by other Sūtra-s showing the same suffix.

3. After exhausting all the rules pertinent to a suffix, forms, derived by the same suffix but found scattered (as illustrations) over different places in the Kṛt section, are discussed in the 'Addenda' to the suffix.
4. The title about forms ending in a particular suffix is followed by a short reference to the rules (— a Sūtra, in 3 figures; a Vārttika, in 4 figures —) showing the occurrence of the suffix. This would facilitate reference to the original.
5. As far as possible, such Observation is given the form of an independent discussion-article, avoiding for the reader frequent reference backwards to get the context. This method has many times caused repetition of the rules or ideas. But the cost was considered not much for clarity's sake.
6. Entering into complicating discussions, straying far from the main line of study, has been avoided. (Thus : on ***kelimar*** of 3.1.96.1 : see fns. 113, 114; on *kaccha-* and *pa-* at the end-portion of Obsn **82**; on *rajaka-* at end-portion of Obsn **96**. II; on *govindu-* at Obsn **94** : fn. 363, and on *grāma-nāya-* at Obsn **107** : fn. 439.)
7. Within an Observation or a discussion,
   (i) mention as a usage 'of' P, Kty or Ptj, stands for a usage 'of the time of' P etc.;
   (ii) mention of a usage as having been 'retained by' Kty, or Ptj, stands for 'prevalence of the usage at the time of' Kty or Ptj;
   (iii) a form is termed 'extraordinary' (or 'irregular') which was recorded by P as a ready-made form (Nipātana) not to be rigorously put to the rules of formation.
8. Sanskrit terms of frequent occurrence within the work are not italicised, though they are shown with diacritical marks.
9. The superscript mark ` denotes the independent circumflex accent.

(D) LIST OF WORKS AND AUTHORS UNDER REFERENCE

[with Abbreviations and Editions where necessary]

(**Note** :-The List excludes common abbreviations including those of the research journals.

Most commonly used short forms are :

Obsn(s)	for Observation(s),
P	for Pāṇini,
Kty	for Kātyāyana,
Ptj	for Patañjali,
Vt	for Vārttika.)

Ā DhSū, Āpastambha-Dharmasūtra with Haradatta's *Ujjvalā*, ed. A. MAHÁDEVA ŚÁSTRI and RANGÁCHÁRYA, Mysore, 1898.

ĀGSū, Aśvalāyana-Gṛhyasūtra, ed. V. L. PANASHIKAR, Bombay, 1909; and (Adhyāya I) ed. Svami RAVI TIRTHA, Adyar, 1944.

AiBr, Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa, ed. Satyavrata SÁMAŚRAMÍ, Bibliotheca Indica, 1895-96; tr. Martin HAUG, Allahabad, 1922.

Anargharāghava of Murāri.

ĀpSS, Āpastamba-Śrautasūtra.

ĀŚSū, Āśvalāyana-Śrautasūtra, ed. Gaṇeśaśāstrī GOKHALE, ASS. no.81, 1917.

AV or *AV-Ś, Atharva-Veda* in the Śaunaka recension, ed. S. P. PANDIT (with the Padapāṭha), 1895-98; translations: (i) R. T. H. GRIFFITH, 1916-17, (ii) W. D. WHITNEY, (reprint) 1962.

AV-P, Atharva-Veda in the Paippalāda recension, (i) for Bk 16 : L. C. BARRET, *The Kashmirian Atharva Veda,* AOS. vol. 9, 1936, (ii) RAGHU VIRA, *Atharva Veda of the Paippalādas,* Lahore 1940

AV-Pariśiṣṭa,, Atharva-Veda-Pariśiṣṭa.

Bālarāmāyaṇa of Rājaśekhara, (1) ed. KERN, Benaras, 1969 (giving **reference** to page and line), (2) ed. Jibananda VIDYASAGARA, Calcutta 1884.

BĀrUp, Bṛhadārnyakopaniṣad.

BD, Bṛhaddevatā attributed to Śaunaka, ed. A. A. MACDONELL, Parts I - II (HOS. 5-6), 1904.

BDhSū, Baudhāyana-Dharmasūtra.

BGītā, Bhagavad-Gītā.

BhāgP, *Bhāgavata-Purāṇa*, ed. M. Eugène BURNOUF, Paris, 1840–47 (giving **reference** to Vol. 3, 1847).

Bhāvaprakāśa.

BhD, Bhaṭṭoji-Dīkṣita.

BHSDi, F. EDGERTON, *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar and Dictionary*, Vol. II (Dictionary), 1953.

BIRWE, Robert BIRWÉ, *Der Gaṇapāṭha zu den Adhyāyas IV und V der Grammatik Pāṇinis : versuch einer Rekonstruktion*, Wiesbaden, 1961 (giving **reference** to the page).

Brahma-Sūtra of Bādarāyaṇa.

Brahmavirarta-Purāṇa.

BŚSū, *Baudhāyana-Śrautasūtra.*

ChBr, *Chāndogya-Brāhmaṇa* ed. Durgamohan BHATTACHARYA, Calcutta, 1958.

ChUp, *Chāndogyopaniṣad.*

CSM, V. P. LIMAYE, *Critical Studies on the Mahābhāṣya*, V. V. R. I., Hoshiarpur (being published shortly).

CTL, *Current Trends in Linguistics*, Ed. Thomas A. SEBEOK, Mouton, The Hague.

DASGUPTA, *Lit*, Preface to DE below.

DASGUPTA, *Philos*, S. N. DASGUPTA, *A History of Indian Philosophy*, Vol. I, 1922.

DE, S. N. DASGUPTA and S. K. DE, *A History of Sanskrit Literature* : Classical Period : Vol. I, Calcutta, 1947.

DhP, *Dhātupāṭha* (according to the *SK* ed. below).

Divy, *Divyāvadāna*, ed P. L. VAIDYA, Darbhanga, 1953; with Gl (ossary) = Appendix III giving **reference** to page and line).

ed., (i) edited by, (ii) edition, or (iii) editor.

EtW, M. MAYRHOFER, *Kurzgefasstes etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen*, Heidelberg.

GBr, *Gopatha-Brāhmaṇa.*

GDhSū, *Gautama-Dharmasūtra.*

GP, *Gaṇapāṭha.*

GRM, *Gaṇaratnamahodadhi*, ed, EGGELING, (1879-81), reprint 1963.

Haravijaya, ed. (with commentary), Kāvyamālā 22, 1890.

Hariv, *Harivaṁśa-parvan*, ed. Pt. R. KINJAWADEKAR, Chitrashala Press, Poona, 1936. (Also the critical ed. by P. L. VAIDYA, B.O.R.I, Poona, 1969–1971.)

Harṣac, *Harṣacarita*, ed. K. P. PARAB, Bombay, 1892.

Īśopaniṣad.

Jaimini-Sūtra

Jaimini-Upaniṣad-Brāhmaṇa.

Jānakīharaṇa of Kumāradāsa, ed. S. PARANAVITANA and C. E. GODAKUMBURA, Ceylon Academy of Letters, Colombo, 1967. (Also : ed. G. R. NANDARGIKAR, Bombay, 1907.)

Kādambarī, ed. KERN, Calcutta, 1851 (quoted at *pw*).

Kaiy, Kaiyaṭa, author of the *Mahābhāṣya-Pradīpa* (giving **reference** to the volume [III, unless otherwise specified], page and column of the NSP. eds. of *M*, I : 1908, II : 1935, III : 1937, IV : 1942, V: 1945).

Kāmandakīya-Nītisāra.

Kāmasūtra of Vātsyāyana.

KathāS, Kathāsaritsāgara (**reference** based on ed. by BROCKHAUS as noted in *PW*).

KāṭhGSū, Kāṭhaka-Gṛhyasūtra.

Kaṭhopaniṣad .

KāṭhS, Kāṭhaka-Saṁhitā of *Yajurveda*, ed. S. D. SATAVALEKAR, 1943.

KauArth, Kauṭilīya Arthaśāstra, ed. R. P. KANGLE, Part I, Bombay, 1960; with Gl (ossary).

KauSū, Kauśika-sūtra of *Atharvaveda*, ed. M. BLOOMFIELD, *JAOS* (1890) 14.

Kirātārjuniya.

KŚSū, Kātyāyana-Śrautasūtra.

Kumāra, Kumārasambhava, ed. K.P. PARAB, Bombay, 1893.

KV, Kāśikā-Vṛtti, ed. SHOBHITA MISHRA, Varanasi, 1952 (giving **reference** to the page).

Laghu-Śabdendu-Śekhara.

M, (*Vyākaraṇa-*) *Mahābhāṣya* of Patañjali, 2nd ed. in 3 volumes by F. KIELHORN, in order, of 1892, 1906, 1909 (giving **reference** to : the volume in Roman figures, and the page and line in Arabic figures).

MānavaŚSū , Mānava-Śrautasūtra ed. J. M. van GELDNER, Śata-Piṭaka Series Vol. 17, New Delhi, 1961.

Manu, Manu-smṛti.

MārkP, Mārkaṇḍeya-Purāṇa, ed. K. M. BANERJEA, Calcutta, 1862.

MBhr, Mahābhārata, the critical ed. published by the B.O.R.I., Poona.

Mṛcchakaṭika.

MS, Maitrāyaṇī-Saṁhitā of *Yajurveda*, ed. S. D. SATAVALEKAR, 1942.

Mudrārākṣasa.

MW, Monier MONIER-WILLIAMS, *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary*, Oxford, 1899.

Nachträge zum Sanskrit-Wörterbuch by Richard SCHIMDT, Leipzig, 1928.

Naiṣadh, Naiṣadhīyacarita by Śrīharṣa.

NBh, Nāgeśa or Nāgojibhaṭṭa, author of the *Mahābhāṣya-Pradīpa—Uddyota* (giving **reference** as with Kaiyaṭa).

Nāgānanda.

Nigh, Nighaṇṭu : See *Nir.*

Nir, Nirukta, ed. L. SARUP, 1927; tr. L.SARUP, (reprint) 1962.

Ny, Nyāsa, for which: Swami Dwarika Das SHASTRI and Pt. Kalika Prasad SHUKLA (ed.), *Nyāsa and Padamañjarī on the Kāśikāvṛtti* (in 6 parts), Varanasi, 1965–67 (giving **reference** generally to the page of Part II, and occasionally to that from the other Parts when so specified).

Padyacū, Padyacūḍāmaṇi of Buddhaghoṣācārya, ed. M. RANGA ACHARYA ond S. KUPPUSWAMI SASTRI, Madras, 1921.

Pañcatantra.

Paribhāṣā-saṁgraha, ed. K.V. ABHYANKAR, B.O.R.I., Poona, 1967.

PdM, Padamañjarī : See *Ny.*

PdP, Padapāṭha.

PGr, Otto BÖHTLINGK, *Pāṇini's Grammatik,* (reprint) 1964.

PGSū, Pāraskara-Gṛhyasūtra.

PhiṭSūtra.

PK, Prakriyā-Kaumudī, ed. K.P. TRIVEDI, Part I, 1925; Part II, 1931.

Prabodha-Candrodaya, ed. V.L. PANASHIKAR, NSP., 1935.

Praṣnopaniṣad.

PŚ, Paribhāṣenduśekhara of Nāgeśa.

Pūrvapn, Pūrvapakṣin.

P&V, P. THIEME, *Pāṇini and the Veda: Studies in the Early History of Lingutstic Science in India,* Allahabad, 1935.

PW, Otto BÖHTLINGK and Rudolf ROTH, *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch* in 7 volumes, St. Petersburg, 1855–75.

pw, Otto BÖHTLINGK, *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch in kürzerer fassung,* St. Petersburg, 1879–86.

Raghu, Raghuvaṁśa, ed. G.R. NANDARGIKAR, Bombay, 1897.

Rājanighaṇṭa.

Rām, Rāmāyaṇa of Vālmīki, the critical ed. published by the Oriental Institute, Baroda.

Rasagaṅgādhara, ed. Kāvyamālā 12, Sixth ed., 1947.

Rūpāvatāra of Dharmakīrti, ed. M. RANGACHARYA, Part II, Madras, 1927.

RV, Ṛg-Veda.

ŚāĀr, Śāṅkhāyana-Āraṇyaka.

Śabda-Kalpa-Druma by Rādhākānta DEVA, Reprint (in 5 volumes) 1961.

ŚabK, *Sabda-Kaustubha*, (Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series, Benares), Vol. I : ed. Pt Gopal Śastri NENE and Pt Mukund Śastri PUNTAMKAR, 1933; Vol. II : ed. Pt Gopal Śastri NENE, 1929 (giving Volume-page **reference**).

ŚāBr, *Śāṅkhāyana-Brāhmaṇa*, ed. G.V. CHHAYA, ASS. 65, 1911.

Saduktikarṇāmṛta of Śrīdharadāsa, ed. S.C. BANERJI, Calcutta, 1965.

Ṣaḍviṁśa-Brāhmaṇa.

SāhD, *Sāhitya-Darpaṇa*, ed. Durgâprasâd DVIVEDA, NSP., 1922.

Śaiśirīya-Sikṣā, ed. T. CHOWDHURY, *Journal of Vedic Studies* (Lahore), Vol. 2, No. 2, Aug. 1935, pp. 197-216.

Sāṅkhyakārikā.

Śatarudriyopaniṣad.

Śaunakopaniṣad.

ŚBr, *Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa*.

SDS, *Sarvadarśanasaṅgraha* of Sāyaṇa-Mādhava, ed. MM. V.S. ABHYANKAR, 2nd ed., 1951.

ŚGSū, *Śāṅkhāyana-Gṛhyasūtra*, ed. G.V. CHHAYA, Rajkot, 1932.

Shabda-Sagara, "chiefly based on Prof. H.H. Wilson's Sanskrit-English Dictionary," ed. Jibananda VIDYASAGARA, 1900.

SK, *Siddhānta-Kaumudī* (with the *Tattva-Bodhinī* etc.), ed. W.L. PA ŚĪKAR, NSP., 7th ed., 1933 (giving **reference** to the Sūtra in the order of *SK* or to the page sometimes).

Śl-Vt, Śloka-Vārttika.

SÖRENSEN, S. SÖRENSEN, ***Index to the Names in the Mahābhārata***, 1904 (reprint, Delhi, 1963).

ŚŚSū, *Śāṅkhāyana-Śrautasūtra*, ed. A. HILLEBRANDT, in 3 volumes, 1888-9.

ŚSū, *Śiva-sūtra*.

Suśruta, *Suśruta-saṁhitā*,

Śvetāśvataropaniṣad.

Tantra-vārttika.

TĀr, *Taittirīyāraṇyaka* (1) ed. Rájendralála MITRA, Calcutta, 1872; (2) ed Babashastri PHADKE, ASS. 36, 1897.

TattvaB, *Tattva-Bodhinī* (giving **reference** to the page of the ed. of *SK* above).

TBr, *Taittirīya-Brāhamaṇa*, ed. R. SHAMA SASTRY, Mysore, 1921.

TMBr, *Tāṇḍya-Mahābrāhmaṇa*, ed. ÁNANDACHANDRA VEDÁNTAVÁGÍŚA, Vol.1, Calcutta, 1870.

TPr, *Taittirīya-Prātiśākhya*, ed. Pt. V. VENKATARAMA SHARMA, University of Madras. 1030.

TS, *Taittirīya-Saṁhitā*, (i) ed., with the commentary of Mādhavācārya, by E. ROER and E.B. COWELL, Bibliotheca Indica, 1860; (ii) ASS. 36, 1897; (iii) ed., with the commentary of Bhaṭṭabhāskaramiśra, by A. MAHÁDEVA ŚÁSTRI and K. RANGÁCHÁRYA in 12 parts, Mysore, 1894–98; (iv) ed. A.B. KEITH, Part 2 (HOS. 19), 1914.

TUp, *Taittirīyopaniṣad*, ed. Pt. ISLAMPURKAR,, ASS. 12, 1889.

USū, *Uṇādi-sūtra*, ed. T. AUFRECHT, Bonn, 1859.

Uttararāmacarita.

Vākyapadīya, (i) with the commentary of Puṇyarāja; ed. Gaṅgadharashāstrī MANAVALLI, Vol. I Benaras, 1887; (ii) the full text: ed K. V. ABHYANKAR, V. P. LIMAYE, Poona, 1965.

VārāhaŚSū, *Vārāha-Śrautasūtra*, ed. CALAND, RAGHU VIRA, Lahore, 1933.

VarBS, Varāhamihira's *Bṛhatsaṁhitā*, ed., with the commentary *Vimalā*, by Achyut anand JHA, Varanasi, 1959.

VarJ, Varāhamihira's *Bṛhajjātaka*.

Vāsav, *Vāsavadattā* of Subandhu, ed. Fitzedward HALL, Calcutta, 1859.

VDh, *Vāsiṣṭha-Dharmaśāstra* (or °*sūtra*), ed FÜHRER, Poona, 1930.

Viddhaśālabhañjikā, ed. J. B. CHAUDHURI in *The Contribution of Women to Sanskrit Literature*, Vol. I (Drama), Calcutta, 1943 (giving reference to page and line).

Vikramāṅkadevacarita.

VPr, *Vājasaneyi-Prātiśākhya*, ed. V. VENKATARAMA SARMA, University of Madras, 1934.

VS, *Vājasaneyi-Saṁhita*, (*Mādhyandina*), ed. A. WEBER, 1852.

VS(*K*), *Vājasaneyi-Saṁhitā* (*Kāṇva*).

VWC, VISHVA BANDHU (ed.), *A Vedic Word-Conocordance*, V. V. R. Institute, Lahore, Hoshiarpur, 1942–61.

VWC Consolidated Indices, on the above, ed. VISHVA BANDHU, Hoshiarpur, Index I: *Ab Initio*, 1964; Index II: *Ab Ultimo*, 1965.

Wörterbuch, *Wörterbuch zum Rigveda* by GRASSMANN (1872), Reprint 1964.

YCampū, *Yaśastilaka-Campū*, ed. ŚIVADATTA and PANŚIKAR, Kāvyamālā 70, Part I (1901) and Part II (1903) (giving reference to the part, page and line).

YV, *Yajur-Veda*.

PART II

The Picture of the Evolution

(with A Brief Analysis of the Findings)

A. THE KṚTYA FORMATIONS

A-1. THE KṚTYA FORMS IN GENERAL

<<1>> FORMS IN *-ELIMA* (*KELIMAR*)

(Vārttika : 3.1.96.1)

Obsn 1 : (i) P did not have Kṛtya forms ending in the suffix *-elima*.

(ii) Both Kty and Ptj used forms ending in this suffix.

(iii) Ptj (and perhaps Kty also) used *pacelima-* and *bhidelima-*.

P lays down application of the most general potential passive pasticipial (Kṛtya) suffix, *-tavya*$_1$ (*tavyat*), *-tavya*$_2$ (*tavya*) and *-anīya* (*anīyar*), at the very start of the Kṛtya Section, by the rule *tavyat-tavyānīyaraḥ* (3.1.96). But in the whole Section he shows no knowledge of forms derived with the suffix *-elima*. So far as we know, the early literature, including the Veda, is also conspicuous by its absence.

Kty, however, detected in his usage probably a number of forms showing this suffix, actually *-elima* (*kelimar*, with the *it-* forces by 1.1.5 and 6.1.217). So in order to account for these, he found the necessity to enumerate this[112] (probably, at that time, entirely new[113]) suffix in addition given earlieer by (3.1. 96.1 *: kelimara upasaṁkhyānam*).[114]

By the time of Ptj the suffix seems to have got well established in the usage, as is clear from the fact that he records not one but two — and two, syntactical — usages of his time by way of illustration. These connected usages containing the actual torms, for the first time recorded by him (*M* II.81. 17-18), are :

pacelimā māṣāḥ (the form in question meaning) : *paktavyāḥ*;

bhidelimāḥ saralāḥ (,,   ,,   ,,   ,,   ) : *bhettavyāḥ*.

Thus we obtain the forms, *pacelima-* " to be cooked " and *bhidelima-* " apt to be split or easily broken ", as used by Ptj.

---

[112] Understanding the use of the plural in the governing rule, *kṛtyāḥ* (3.1.95), to cover all that ought to be, but that has not been, covered (— *bahuvacanam anukta-samuccayārtham*—), *Ny* and *PdM* (494 f.) take the rule as it is to be indicating inclusion of the suffix *kelimar*. (Also *ŚabK* II. 402.)

[113] JOSHI-ROODBERGEN, however, suggest : "...the suffix might be regarded a different regional usage. It need not be necessarily taken as a later development." Vide p. ix : fn. 25 from their book (for which : fn. 53 above).

[114] For the doubts on the genuine nature of this Vt, however, see S. D. LADDU, "Authorship of a Vārttika from the *Mahābhāṣya*", *JUP* (1970) 33.13-22.

It needs to be noted, however, that we get no record at the hands of Ptj showing forms with this new suffix added to any of the vowel-ending roots. This is in spite of the fact that Kty has noted it under the most general Kṛtya rule of P showing forms from all types of roots with the addition of *-tavya* and *-anīya*.

Furthe the most general nature of the Vt of Kty allows us to see only a possibility (—even a probability, but not a certainty—) of currency in his usage of the **particular** forms *pacelima-* and *bhidelima-*, ending with this suffix, even though the roots *√pac-* and *√bhid-* are found used by Kty.

USū has derived the form *pacelima-* by *paca elimac* (4.37). It appears strange that the senses or contexts given to it by Ujjvaladatta are the fire and the sun (*pacelimo vahni-ravyoḥ*, p.101).

The earliest literary usage of this suffix appears to be attested only in 959 A. D. by Somadeva-sūri in *YCampū* (I.96.3-4) recording the form *pacelima-* in *°kharjūraphala-pacelimatā-'ruṇita°*. *bhidelima-* occurs probably first in the *Jānakīharaṇa*[115] of Kumāradāsa : *itī jalpati tatra rākṣasī purataḥ prādurabhūd bhidelimā* (4.61); it means there "worthy of being killed, deserving death" (vide NANDARGIKAR, Notes, 147). It is also found to occur in the *Saduktikarṇāmṛta*[116] of Śrīdharadāsa in a verse attributed to one Jalacandra in *bhidelima-phala-vyālola-tūlotkaraiḥ*.

---

[115] Composed before the tenth century A.D. according to DE (185); sometime during 684-718 A.D. according to PARANAVITANA (Introd., lxi).

[116] (*Apadeśa*) *Pravāha* 4, (*Śālmali*) *Vīci* 55,3 (= 4.273 or 1913), p. 519.

<< 2 >> FORMS IN *-TAVYA* (*TAVYAT, TAVYA*)

(Sūtra : 3.1.96)

Obsn 2: (i) P knew the form *vāstavya-* but did not derive it as a primary formation in the agent sense from √*vas-*. Perhaps he treated it as a secondary formation.

(ii) Both Kty and Ptj used the form in that sense, but were not sure whether to accept it as a primary or as a secondary formation.

By his rule *tavyattavyānīyarah* (3.1.96) P seeks to establish the primary forms in *tavyà* (*-tavya*$_1$ or *tavyat*: accent by 6.1.185 and 1.1.72), *-távya* (*-tavya*$_2$ or *tavya* : accent by 3.1.3) and *-anī́ya* (*anīyar* : accent by 6.1.217).

From the root √*vas-*, addition of the first two suffixes would give the forms, *vastavyá-* and *vasitavyá* (with *tavyat*) and *vastávya-* and *vasítavya-* (with *tavya*); but to establish the form *vāstavyá-* " one who resides " (showing the Vṛddhi in the root, as well as the Anta-svarita), no Prakriyā is provided by P. Kty detected the existence of this last form in his usage. But in addition to its formation[117] that was different form the one normally supposed from the rules of P, the form as used in the time of Kty showed him also a semantic peculiarity of carrying the agent sense (cf. *vasati=iti, M* II 81.20); for, P had in general found (and formulated in *tayor eva kṛtya-kta-khalarthāḥ,* 3.4.70) either the objective or the impersonal sense in the Kṛtya-formations. So in his supplementary rule Kty includes all these features that the form expressed to him. (3.1.96.2 : *vases tavyat kartari ṇic ca.*)

P's total silence, not only on its semasiology but also on its morphology, tends to indicate that the form did not exist in the common usage of his time as a Kṛdanta (at least in its agent sense); that was probably the cause of his failure to take note of it. It gained currency later in the usage of the time of Kty and continued to do so in the usage of the time of Ptj as is indicated by Ptj's gloss and much more so by Kty's strong effort to establish it somehow as can be shortly seen.

Alternatively, Kty (3.1.96.3 : *taddhito vā*) suggests to look at it as only a secondary formation[118] (derivable from *vāstu-*, as *vāstuni bhavaḥ, M* II.81.22, with the addition of *yat* by 4.3.54, and meaning "situated, settled or residing in a house").[119] It has to be noted that even according to this type of formation, the accent in the form would remain the same as in the case of its earlier derivation as a primary form, viz. Anta-svarita by the rule of P (6.1.185).

---

[117] As Kty wants in his form the accent technically indicated by the suffix *tavyat,* he chooses that (and not *tavya*) in giving its formation; but as, in addition the Vṛddhi was also to be indicated, he seems to modify the suffix into **tavyat-ṇ* to make it capable (by 7.2.116) of indicating it.

[118] For, says Kaiy, some (derivative) explanation has got to be offered for words that have found a permanent place in the usage. (*nityānāṁ śabdānāṁ yathākathaṁcid anvākhyānaṁ kartavyam iti manyate.* 141 b.)

Now there are three more cases (see fn. 119) where Kty gives additional forms for which he suggests an alternative derivation with a Taddhita suffix. At two of these places (3.1.97.3, 3.2.60.3) Ptj rejects the plea for a secondary derivation and accepts the primary derivation. Here, however, (as on 3.2.15.5) he is silent and produces no ground against the secondary derivation. Thus, both Kty as well as Ptj leave it open whether the form *vāstavya-* be accepted as a ***nipātita*** primary formation (containing two extra-ordinary suggestions of the Vṛddhi and the agent sense), or be straightaway taken as a secondary formation.

Later scholiasts like the authors of *KV* and *SK* make even no mention of the secondary derivation alternatively suggested by Kty here.

Although we do not know for certain why Kty was in two minds, still it appears to us that, when the secondary derivation gives rise to no difficulty in the accent, compounding etc., and when the primary derivation involves two out-of-the-way procedures, it is better to suppose P to have favoured the secondary derivation of the form which he knew in all of its forces from the Vedic literature onwards.

The form in the agent sense has been found used at a number of places in the Veda (cf. *vāstavyàm agním úpāsīta, TBr* 1.4.4.7), perhaps also (as a final member of a compound) once each in *MBhr* (*bahūni grāma-vāstavyā roṣād brūyuḥ parasparam / na teṣāṁ vacanād rājā satkuryād yātayeta vā //* 12.130.11) and in *Rām* (*nānānagara-vāstavyān pṛthagjānapadān api / samāninaya medinyāḥ pradhānān pṛthivīpatiḥ //* 2.1.35), and by Śabara on the *Jaimini-Sūtra* 10.5.4 (*atha yad uktaṁ, samājeṣu samāseṣu cā' gantur jano yathā vāstavyān anupamṛdyaiva niviśate, evam ihāpīti. yuktaṁ yad vāstavyair ākrānte deśa āgantur jano'saṁbhavād ante niviśate*). (Side by side with this, a Vedic use of the form in another sense (viz. location) also is found recorded (cf. *yad vai yajñá-*

---

[119] It is not that with this 'secondary' suggestion (following the earlier or 'primary' one) Kty is shy or apologetic for his first suggestion on account of the addition of an extra *it* letter involved in it. For, wherever else (i.e. at 3.1.108.1 and 3.2.38.3) he similarly suggests an extra *it*, that is **not** followed by a suggestion for a Taddhita-formation; or, reversely also, none of his other Taddhita suggestions (i.e. at 3.1.97.3, 3.2.15.5 and 3.2.60.3) is preceded by an extra-*it* suggestion. It only appears that that the cause of his second thought (opting for a secondary formation) was that he was not really very happy at the serious departure from the generalised *karma-bhāva* forces involved in his first suggestion. True, P himself exhibited such a departure; but that (3.4.68) was only once, at the end of the whole section, and in respect of a few extraordinary cases (Nipātana-s) only, which, while alternatively expressing the agent sense, had side by side retained their common objective or impersonal sense.

sya vāstavyàṁ kriyáte, TBr l.c.). Later this peculiar usage is attested in *KathāS* 38.107 (*ihaivāsmi vāstavyo nagare dvijaḥ*).[120]

Addenda to << 2 >>

(Formations by the Sūtra 3.1.96.)

Obsn 3 : (i) P and Kty knew the form *cetavya-*, and possibly also the forms, *lavitavya-*, *paktavya-* and *bhettavya-*.

(ii) Ptj had all the four forms in his usage.

At different places Ptj makes reference to the following forms which he must have taken from his own usage: *lavitavya-* "to be cut" (II.78.3), *cetavya-* "to be gathered" (II.78.11), *paktavya-*[121] "to be cooked" (II.81.17, as a gloss on *pacelima-*, II.86.25 and III.23.7) and *bhettavya-* "to be broken" (II.81.18 as a gloss on *bhidelima-*).

Of these, *cetavya-* occurs in the Veda, and P and Kty must have known it; possibly they also knew the simple forms, *lavitavya-*, *paktavya-* and *bhettavya-*, the last two of which are found to occur in *MBhr* and *Rām* respectively.

---

[120] According to *PW* 6.972.

[121] The *ku-tva* is by the rule 8.2.30.

<< 3 >> FORMS IN -YA_1 (*YAT*)

(Sūtra-s : 3.1.97-106)

Obsn 4 : (i) P used the form *janyà-* (in the agent as well as the objective senses),

(ii) Kty probably used this *janyà-* and, in addition, in the objective sense only, used *jánya-*.

(iii) ' Apara ' preceding Ptj used these two, plus *yátya-*.

(iv) Ptj used these three, plus *tákya-*, *śasya-* and *cátya-*.

(A) The form *janya-* is found recorded by P among the few extraordinary Kṛtya-cases[122] that possess the agent sense, in addition to the objective sense (for transitive roots) or the impersonal sense (for intransitive roots) commonly observed in the Kṛtya-forms. So *janya-*[123] meant to him either " (an agent) being born " or " producing (agent) " (*jāyate ' sau, KV* 241), in addition to " having been born " or " (an object) being produced " (*janyam anena*, loc. cit.). The form can be derived from √*jan-* by his general rule for consonant-ending roots, *ṛ-halor-ṇyat* (3.1.124), by the addition of the suffix *ṇyat* (the Vṛddhi due to *ṇ*, occasioned by *ata upadhāyāḥ*, 7.2.116, being here ruled out by *jani-vadhyoś ca*, 7.3.35).

Even with this information before him, Kty makes the form the subject of a special rule (3.1.97.1 : *yati janer upasaṁkhyānam*), enumerating it under forms taking the suffix *yat* that is laid down by P by his general rule *aco yat* (3.1.97) for vowel-ending roots. — Ptj too accepts this additional rule of Kty and illustrates it with a usage containing *janya-* in the objective sense : *janyaṁ vatsena* (II.82.14).

The commentators Kaiy (142a) and NBh (142b, 147b) step in here with the suggestion that the reason for this discrepancy is to be sought in the difference in accentuation of the form by P and by Kty, — P having *janyà-* (with *ṇyat*[124] causing the final circumflex by *tit svaritam*, 6.1.185) and Kty having *jánya–* (with *yat* causing accent on the first syllable by *yáto ' ṇāvaḥ*, 6.1.213)[125]. This sounds reasonable, and could be accepted as reflecting the situation properly.

---

[122] *bhavya-geya-pravacanīya=upasthānīya-janya=āplāvya=āpātyā vā*, 3.4.68.

[123] Derivable either from the intrans. √*jan-* in the *prādurbhāva* sense (4th Conjug., *DhP* 1149) of from the trans. √*jan-* in the *janana* sense (3rd Conjug., *DhP* 1105),

[124] The difficulty is that we do not have with us an accented text of P's rules. It is quite likely that Kty possessed such a one. Even in this circumstance it is probable that, in the rule 3.4.68 quoted above, P ingeniously tries to divide (in the same rule) the forms in *-ya* into those in *yat* and those in *ṇyat* : *bhavya-* and *geya-* being with *yat*, and *janya-* and the following (— **separated** by forms in *-anīya* —) being with *ṇyat*. This surmise is supported by the commentator's observation (— see fn. 125 —) that *janya-* (in P, referring probably to this rule) must be formed with *ṇyat*.

Kty and Ptj leave the rule 3.4.68 containing *janya–* uncommented. This fact suggests that they accept the form there as it was with P, i. e. as *janyà–* with *ṇyat.*

So it can be said that P had *janyà* in the agent and the objective senses; that Kty had *jánya–* (in the object sense) beside *janyà–* as used by P; and that Ptj had same usage continued.

(B) " Another (grammarian) " (' Apara'), referred to by (and hence preceding) Ptj on 3.1.112 (II.86.5), records in his Śl–Vt 2 there, two forms from his usage, *yatya–* " to be striven after " and *janya–*, as having been developed in his times, but as cannot be had by P's rules of formation. He, therefore, attributes them to P's rule, *kṛtya–lyuṭo bahulam* (3.3.113), taking it to allow freedom in formation to forms with *kṛtyà* and *lyuṭ* suffixes (II. 86.10.12).[126] This meant not only that he accepted Kty's *janya–*, but that (as probably he lived after him) he used one more special form, *yatya–*, with *yat* atttached to √*yat–*. By P's rule it would have been **yātya–* with *ṇyat.*

(C) Ptj was, however, confronted with three more forms beside the *janya–* of Kty and the *yatya–* of ' Apara ', viz. *takya–* " to be rushed forth " or " to be laughed at " or " to be endured ",[127] *šasyā–* " to be slaughtered," and

---

[125] Kaiy (142 a) : *yati janer iti. yato 'nāva iti svarārthaṁ janer yad-vidhānam.* (P's earlier) *'janyam' iti tu ṇyatā 'pi sidhyati, janivadhyoś ceti vṛddhipratiṣedhāt.*

[126] *athavā 'bahulaṁ kṛtyāḥ', saṁjñāyām iti tat smṛtam /*
yathā yatyaṁ, yathā janyaṁ, yathā bhittis, tathaiva sā //
Drawing a hint from this, NBh there (147b) remarks that Kty's present rule (3.1.97.1) is also unnecessary, as its purpose of establishing the form *janya-* with an accent different from P's is achieved by the present Bāhulaka-rule of P (that is supposed to show green light to all sorts of licenses in the Kṛtya and *lyuṭ* formations). (Vide *janye svarārthaṁ yad eveṣyate, sa bāhulakād eva siddha; iti, yati janer ity uktam upasaṁkhyānaṁ na karyam, iti bodhyam.*) — This, however, appears to be drawing a limitless license from the license-rule itself, and would in one stroke make the whole painstakingly descriptive work of Kty superfluous. Even Ptj — who seeks to extend the scope of the Bāhulaka-rule over the whole of the Kṛt Section (*'kṛto bahulam' iti vaktavyaṁ*, II. 155.12) — has not rushed everywhere to question the wisdom of Kty's job.

[127] The first meaning is according to that given to the root in *Nigh* (2.14 : *gati-karmāṇaḥ*) and as attested generally in the early Vedic literature. *Nir* (9.3, 11.25) is not clear about the meaning in the forms it has used. The second and the third ones are according to *DhP* (117), *taka hasane* (v.l. *sahane*).

catya- "to be hidden" or "to be gone" or "to be implored"[128], derived respectively from *√tak-*, *√śas-* and *√cat-*. These roots also, being all consonant-ending, would, according to the rules of P, have taken the suffix *ṇyat* and the consequent vṛddhi (— in the absence of any special rule prohibiting it); and we would have instead got the forms, **tākya-*, **śāsya-* and **cātya-* respectively. Only absence of evidence of the use of these latter indicates that they were not in the usage at any stage. It is known that forms from *√tak-* and *√cat-*, rare in the classical literature, are met with in the Veda, though the roots are not mentioned by P in his rules; and it is also known that *√yat-* and *√śas-* are mentioned by P. So it is likely that the Kṛtya-forms from *√yat-* and *√śas-* (and perhaps those from *√tak-* and *√cat-* also) were in the usage of P and even in that of Kty. Whether they were **yātya-*, and **śāsya-* (and **tākya-* and **cātya-*) respectively, or *yatya-* and *śasya-* (and *takya-* and *catya-*) respectively, cannot be stated definitely. If scientific notes of the early grammarians can be indications of the exact usage of the times, it can be said that only *yatya-*, and not **yātya-*, was used (beside *janya-*) at the time of 'Apara', and that all the four, *yatya-*, *takya-*, *śasya-* and *catya-*, (beside *janya-*) were used at the time of Ptj. That indicates that *yatya-* was not used before 'Apara' and that *takya-*, *śasya-* and *catya-*, were not found even in the usage of 'Apara' — and hence in that of Kty and P also—but were later developements. Ptj thus saw the necessity to redraft the Vt of Kty (that drew only *janya-* under *yat*), so as to extend its scope over these four new forms. (Cp. *atyalpam idam ucyate. 'taki-śasi-cati-yati-janīnām upasaṁkhyānam' iti vaktavyam.* II.82.13.) The suffix seen in them by Ptj indicates that the forms as used showed to him the accent on the first syllable (by 6.1.213) as *tákya-*, *śásya-*, *cátya-* and *yátya-*.

yatya- recorded by 'Apara' is not attested in literature. So too, *takya-*, *catya-* and *śasya-*[129] that were recorded by Ptj. *janya-* is common in the Veda (once as *janyá-* at *AV* 13.4.43), is known to *MBhr* (1.186.1, 8.47.6) and is found in the *Brahmavaivarta-Purāṇa* : *Śrīkṛṣṇajanma-khaṇḍa* (*janakasya svabhāvo hi janye tiṣṭhati niścitam*) as quoted by the *Śabda-Kalpa-Druma* (II. 511b).

---

[128] The first meaning is according to that attested generally in the forms from the root in the Vedic literature as late as *TĀr* and also in the untraced Vedic quotation recorded in *KV* on 7.2.34 (viz *cattā varṣṇa vidyut*)*; the second one is according to *Nigh* (2.14) meaning of the root (probably which, in a causal form in *RV* 10.155.1, is accepted in *Nir* (6.30) in the words, *cātayatir nāśane*); and the third one is according to *DhP* (865), *cate....yācane.* (*Mahesh Dutt SHARMA, however, has noted its similarity with *ca tvā varṣeṇa vidyutā* (*AV-P* 17.12.10). Vide p. 139 of his "Kāśikā-Siddhāntakaumudyor Vedavacanāni" (in Sanskrit), *Sāgarikā* (1971) 10.135-43.)

[129] *śásyā-* of *ŚBr* (14.6.1.9, 12) is derived from √*śaṁs-* "to praise" (*DhP* 728), while our form is from √*śas-* "to kill" (727).

Obsn 5 : (i) Apparently P did not derive *vắdhya–* from √*han–*, though he knew and used it. Or he used it as an uncompounded Taddhita form.

(ii) Kty and Ptj had it in their usage.

(iii) On *asivắdhya–* and *musalavắdhya–* from Ptj's usage, nothing definite can be said as for their currency, their accent or the nature of their formation, in the usage of Kty.

Kty noticed the form *vắdhya–* " to be killed " in his usage which he derived from √*han–* substituted by *vadha–*[130] and the suffix *yat*. *vadha–* is enjoined in place of √*han–* by P only in the Benedictive and the Aorist [131] (and probably also at 3.3.76). Hence it is that Kty adds his rule (3.1.97.2) to have it in the case of a potential participle also.

The potential participle *vadhya–* is of frequent occurrence in the Veda, and even P has used it once (4.4.91). Still he did not give a rule for the substitution of √*han–* by *vadha–* in the Kṛtya Section. —Or did he derive the form from the consonant–ending √*vadh–* (a root by itself) ?

Kty's alternative suggestion (3.1.97.3) of taking *vắdhya–* as a secondary form (meaning " deserving killing ") [132] that seeks to escape the above difficulty, is rejected by Ptj. Ptj's argument is that (although probably *vắdhya–* can be a secondary form), neither (1) the compounding in forms like *asi–vadhya–*, *musala–vadhya–* etc. (with the secondarily derived *vadhya–* as their final member), nor, alternatively, (2) the accent in usage in forms like *asivắdhya–* etc. when these are supposed to be secondarily derived as a whole from compounds like *asi-vadha–* etc. (and having *vadhya–* as their final portion), can be justified on grammatical grounds.[133] As such, he favours *vadhya–* as well as compounds ending in it to be understood only as primary formations[134]; however, P's rules do not appear to provide for the establishment of the formation (s).

---

[130] Changed to *vadh-* by *ato lopaḥ*, 6.4.48. For grammatical operations, however, it is to be considered as being *vadha-* by the Sthānivadhhāva. The Vṛddhi to the final vowel (7.2.115) is prohibited (according to 6.4.48.1) by the rule of the Superiority of the Former (Pūrva-vipratiṣedha, viz. here, that of Lopa over Vṛddhi.

[131] *hano vadha liṅi; luṅi ca;* 2.4.42, 43. Kty reminds us there (2.4.42.1) that if this were supposed to be the consonant-ending *vadh-* substitute, the denial of the Vṛddhi and *ta-tva* has already been pointed out at 1.1.56.22. But Ptj takes the substitute to be vowel-ending and so does not find the need of the Vārttika. P's *jani-vadhyoś ca* (7.3.35), which also enjoins denial of the Vṛddhi, is not commented upon by Kty or Ptj, and is supposed by *KV* to refer to the consonant-ending root √*vadh-*.

[132] With *yat* by *daṇḍādibhyo yat*, 5.1.66. *vadha-* finds a place in the reconstructed *daṇḍādi-gaṇa* of BIRWE (315).

It deserves to be noted in all this, that the discussion relating to *vadhya–*, either as a full (final) member of a compound or as an accidentally final portion of a secondary formation from a compound, is carried on first only by Ptj. So, inspite of his remarks against Kty's suggestion to understand *vadhya–* as a secondary from, we could probably be fair to the very meticulous Vārttika-kāra and defend his suggestion on historical grounds like the following:

(1) Either Kty's usage did not at all show forms like *asivadhya–*, *musalavadhya–* etc (he is found to use not *musala–* but *asi–* twice at 1 4 1 32, 1.4.23.13) that were found developed later in Ptj's usage, Kty having used only *vadhya–* (derived secondarily from *vadha–*);

(2) or Kty's usage did contain such forms (beside the secondary form *vadhya–*), but they showed the accent as *asivadhyà–* etc. (when they could be derived secondarily from *asi–vadha–*etc.) as against *asivádhya–* etc. of Ptj.

At the same time, it is also likely that P used *vadhya–* as a Taddhita form but not any compound ending with it.

asivadhya– and *musalavadhya–* are not found attested in literature.

Obsn 6 : (i) P used the form *carya–*, but probably not *ācarya–*.
(ii) Kty and Ptj used both.

From consonant-ending roots P would be generally deriving the Kṛtya-forms (by 3 1.124) with the suffix *ṇyat* (causing the Vṛddhi in the penultimate *a* of the root and the Anta-svarita in the form). But, from the four roots,

---

[133] (1) As for the compound-final *-vadhya-* (derived from *vadha-*) like *asi-vádhya-* "to be killed with a sword" or *musala-vadhya-* "...with a pestle" (standing for *asinā vadhyaḥ* or *musalena va°*) of Ptj (II.82.19), the compounding with *vadhya-* as a primary form may be had by Kty's rule, *sādhanaṁ kṛteti vā, pādahārakādyartham* (2.1.33.2), and the accent is got by P's rule, *gatikārakopapadāt kṛt* (6.2.139). But, such a compounding with a secondary form (like *vádhya-*) is not made possible by any rule of P. (Cf. *tena saha samāsasya lakṣaṇābhāvāt*, Kaiy, 142b; and NBh, ib., on it: *'sup supā'=iti tu na sārvatrikam ity arthaḥ.*)
(2) Next, formations like *asivadhya-*, derived even from the whole compounds like *asi-vadha-*, cannot be treated as secondary formations with *yat* by *daṇḍādibhyo yat* (as *asi-vadham arhati=iti asivadhyaḥ*), for two reasons: (i) this form would be *asivadhyà-* (by 6.1.185), while Ptj's was *asivádhya-* (II.82.21-22); and (ii) the *daṇḍādi* forms taking *yat* include only the bare *vadha-*, but not a compound ending in it. (This latter is from Kaiy, 142 b; *na cāsivadha-śabdāt prāpnoti yat, daṇḍādiṣu kevala-vadha-śabdasya pāṭhāt, tadantavidhy-abhāvac ca.*)

[134] Remarks NBh, 142 b: *evaṁ ca, 'taddhitanāsiddhir' iti vārttikaṁ kāryam eva, iti bhāvaḥ.*

√gad-, *√mad-*, *√car-* and *√yam-*, when they were not preceded by an Upasarga, he derived the forms with the addition of the suffix *yat*; this made the forms bear the acute accent on the first syllable of the form (by 6.1.213). So he framed the rule, *gada-mada-cara-yamaś cānupasarge* (3.1.100). Thus, form *√car-* "to approach or to practise" he derived the form, *cárya-* "to be approached or to be practised"; and with his condition '*anupasarge*', he indicated that, when preceded by an Upasarga, *√car-* in his usage regularly derived the form, *-cāryà-*, with *ṇyat*.

But Kty noticed in his usage not only the form *carya-*, derived with *yat* from bare *√car-*, but also the form, *ācarya-* ("to be approached or to be practised," but according to Ptj) "approachable, communicable", derived with *yat* from *√car-* even when preceded by the Upasarga *ā-*. This was obviously a new development, and Kty was required to take note of it. (3.1.100.1 : *anupasargāc carer āṅi cāgurau.*) However, he took care to point out the correspondence of this difference in form with the difference in meaning : the other form (viz. *ācārya-*)[135] derived from the same root and the same Upasarga, but carrying the sense of "a preceptor", was to show the suffix (*ṇyat*) that was regular for a consonant-ending root. — The corresponding usages for these as recorded by Ptj (II 83.3,4) are : *ācaryo deśaḥ* "a communicable region", and *ācārya upanayamānaḥ* "a preceptor who performs the Thread-ceremony (of a young boy)."

It may be noted that the use of '*ca*' in the Vt is indicative of an 'addition' of this new form that was not derived by P but that existed in his usage : an 'addition' it was, obviously to the *carya-* derived earlier by P and that must be side by side existing in the usage of his time also.

Ptj's gloss shows the prevalence of the same usage in his time also.

It is curious, however, that though P does not derive *ācarya-*, at the same time he elsewhere lists *āścarya-*[136] in the rule, *āścaryam anitye* (6. 1. 147), as a conditioned extraordinary form showing the augment *suṭ*. But as the Sūtra is not commented upon by Kty or Ptj, that does not give a definite indication[137] that he had in his usage also another form without *suṭ*, viz. *ācarya-*, when the sense was other than '*anitya*', although it is so recorded in *KV* (497) there as a part of the usage, *ācaryaṁ karma śobhanam* wherein too the meaning of the term is (not "approachable". as in the usage recorded by Ptj, but) "to be practised". Besides, this the form is not attested in literature. As for *ācārya-*, it is of age-old occurrence. The simple *carya-* "to be practised" is attested in *Manu* (3.1) : *ṣaṭtriṁśadābdikaṁ caryaṁ gurau traivedikaṁ vratam.*[138]

---

[135] For which see Obsn **41**.

[136] On *āścarya-*, for the latest attempt at derivation, see P. TEDESCO, "Again, Sanskrit *āścarya-* 'wondrous'," *JAOS* (1965) 85.86-88.

[137] For a different view, taking the Vt to be unnecessary, see *Ny* (499); *sa tu jñāpakād eva sidhyati=iti nopasaṁkhyeyaḥ* etc.

Obsn 7 : (1) P had the form *árya-* in the senses of "a master" and "a trader". He did not care for the very common older form *arya-* "a master" probably because it was out of usage then.

(ii) Perhaps Kty noted the Vedic *aryá-* "a master"; probably he had in his usage that as well, as P's *árya-* in its both the senses.

(iii) Probably Ptj retained the usage of Kty.

There was a form *arya-* in P's speech, bearing the twin senses of "a master" and "a trader". The root *√ṛ-* "to go or approach (with respect)" at the base of this would normally (by 3.1.124) be deriving the form *ārya-* " (an) honourable (person)" with *ṇyat-* (as in *āryo brāhmaṇaḥ KV* 161), but not *arya-* showing no Vṛddhi. So he gives a special rule (*aryaḥ svāmivaiśyayoḥ*; 3.1.103) to include it among forms taking the suffix *yat*. At the same time he differentiates *arya-* and *ārya-* by giving their semantic distribution, *arya-* being restricted to the above two senses (while *ārya-* probably referring to a brahmin).

Now, as P records *arya-* among forms taking *yat*, it is certain that he pronounced it as *árya-* (with the accent by 6.1.213) and that the accentuation was alike for **both** the senses which the form conveyed. The Saṁhitā texts of the Veda mostly show *aryá-* in the sense of "a master"[139]. (*Nigh* 2.22 notes *aryá-* among synonyms for *īśvara* " a master.") P did not give it,[140] and the reason for this must be its absence in his usage. That he did not wish to refer to a Vedic usage is clear from the absence in the Sūtra of the qualifying term, '*chandasi*.' The shift of accent in *arya-* in the sense of " *svāmin* " (*aryá->árya-*) was perhaps an analogical extension from *árya-* in the sense of " *vaiśya* " current in his speech then.

But Kty (*svāminy antodāttatvaṁ ca*, 3.1.103.1) makes a special record of *aryá-* " a master ", [141] which perhaps shows that the older form was revived in his speech with its original semantic force. Further, the '*ca*' in the Vt may suggest that the new form was an addition to the earlier *árya*- of P (in its two senses) that still existed in Kty's usage (*svāminy* ((*arthe* ' *arya* ' *ity atra ādyudāttatvaṁ ca*)) *antodāttatvaṁ ca*). That Kty by his Vt wanted to point to a usage not restricted to the Vedic literature is indicated by the fact that he did not use the expression *chandasi* in his note which he uses in such cases; [142] otherwise he would have worded his note somewhat like '*svāmini cic chandasi*'. If, however his note were still understood to be referring only to the Vedic usage, it will have to be said that Kty was simply pointing out the Vedic peculiarity that he felt P forgot to note. But there need not be any surprise or uncommonness felt, in the case of a social phenomenon like language, at the recurrence of a tendency which had dropped out of use at an earlier time-interval.[143]

---

[138] It appears mysterious how neither P nor Kty nor Ptj noted the following *sopasarga carya*-formations: *anucarya-* (*GBr* 2.5.9), *upacárya-* (*TS* 5.7.6.1), *upacarya-* (*JUBr* 2.14, *BŚS* 18.44), *paricarya-* (*ChUp* 8.8.4) and *saṁcarya- ĀpŚS* 6.2.8.9).

[139] For a contrastive distribution of *arya-* in its three accents, see M. D. BALASUBRAHMANYAM at *BDCRI* (1962-63) 23.95 ("The Accentuation of *arya-* in Pāṇini and the Veda"). See further his "*Arya-*: an Accentual Study", *Indian Antiquary*, Third Series (Prof. R. N. DANDEKAR Felicitation Volume, 1969) 3.112-127.

[140] *Ny* (500f.) wants us to understand the Sūtra as giving a condensed mention of both : *tatredaṁ vyākhyānam. 'tantreṇa'=iha dvāv 'arya'-śabdāv uccāritau; tatra eka ādyudāttaḥ, aparo 'ntodāttaḥ.* BhD takes up Haradatta's (501) question, *atha yo vaiśyaḥ svāmī ca tatra katham*, and answers, *tathā ca=īdṛśe viṣaye yugapad artha-dvaya-vivakṣā na kartavyā=iti phalito 'arthaḥ.* (*ŚabK* II. 406).

[141] So also the *PhiṭSūtra* (I.18) : *aryasya svāmyākhyā cet.*

As for Ptj, the bare explanation given by him of Kty's Vt gives no definite indication that he had retained in his usage the peculiarity noted by Kty. But such an indication may be obtained (negatively) from the absence of any modificatory note from him. The form is not attested in classical Sanskrit.

Obsn 8 : (i) P used the form *a-jarya*- (probably in the agent sence) in an appositional construction with *saṁgata*-; in a similar construction with another word he might have used some such form as *a-jara*- or *a-jaritṛ*-.

(ii) The same was the case with Kty. He brought out the obvious agent force of *a-jarya*-.

(iii) Ptj ased *a-jarya*- in appositional construction with *saṁgata*- and in the agent sense; he used *a-jara*- or *a-jaritṛ*- in a similar construction with *kambala*-.

P (3.1.105) has made an extraordinary enumeration (Nipātana) of the form *a-jarya*- "not subject to decay, long-lasting, imperishable" (with the Kṛtya-member of the compound, i.e. *jarya*-, derivable from √jṝ- "to decay") under the forms taking the suffix *yat* (instead of *ṇyat* by 3.1.124). He has also given the syntactical condition (or construction) in which the formation can occur, viz. only as qualifying the form *saṁgata*–"companionship, friendship".[144] (Cf. *ajaryam ārya-saṁgatam, ajaryaṁ no' stu saṁgatam KV* 161). —In a different construction (i.e. with the word qualified being other than *saṁgata*–), the root would not take the suffix *yat* but *ac* or *tṛc*, as in Ptj 's examples (II.83.9), *a-jaraḥ kambalaḥ* and *a-jaritā kambalaḥ*. (Compare also the observation in fn. 145 below.) Though some counter-example must be current in the uasges of P and Kty it cannot be said with certainty that exactly any of these (as supplied by Ptj) were used as such by them.

---

[142] Cf. *hanastaś cit striyāṁ chandasi*, 3.1.108.1, where also the Antodāttatva in the form is pointed out.

[143] Cp. G. V. DEVASTHALI (vide fn. 60 above),
(i) fn. 35 on p. 62 there: "The course of evolution of any science (and grammar is one of them), it may be remembered, is never a straight line, so much so that every step taken is not necessarily a step forward. The course is 'often subject to interruption, and interspered with digressions,' though broadly speaking the science can be said to be making a real progress. (For similar remarks concerning 'History of Philosophy' cf. *A History of Philosophy* by Clement C. J. WEBB, p. 13)."
(ii) p. 59: "In fact as remarked above, in the life of a language there may and do occur epochs during which it may seem to go against what may (from a broader point of view) be labelled a general tendency of it."
(iii) p. 59: "...linguistic laws can never be absolute and exceptionless in their character."

The form in construction obviously shows the agent sense, in exception to the objective or the impersonal sense primarily noted in the Kṛtya-suffixes by P. Kty (Vt 1) notes that; but there is some argumentation by Ptj (II.83.12 ff.) whether his note bringing out the speciality in the usage was necessary or not (it being understandable from cartain indications).

It is clear from P's phrasing of the sūtra (*ajaryaṁ saṁgatam*) that he wants the use of the irregular form *a–jarya*– only as bound up in construction with the substantive *saṁgata*–; and thus the conditions of the Nipātana of *yat* after √*jṝ*– would be:

(1) compounding with the privative particle *a*–, (2) an appositional construction with *saṁgata*–, and also — by implication — (3) the agent force[145].

There is, therefore, to be seen here a continuity of the usage from P to Ptj.

The form is found in *ChBr* (2.2.15, with Sāyaṇa's text as *ajayya*–), *ŚBr* (3.4.2.4.) and *Śaunakopaniṣad* (para 2) though without '*saṁgata*–'

Addenda to <<3>>

(Formations by Sūtra-s 3.1.97, 98.)

Obsn 9: (i) P or Kty did not use the form *upaceya-pṛḍa*–.

(ii) Ptj used it in the sense other than gold.

The form, ***upaceya–pṛḍa–***, is a counter–illustration supplied by Ptj, to the Vedic form, ***upacāyyapṛḍa***–, that was noted by P (3.1.123) and that was restricted to the sense of "gold" by Ptj. Thus *upaceya–pṛḍa*– probably meant according to him "what was to be collected and was pleasing".

---

[144] Cp. NBh 143 b: *Saṁgatam iti maitrī-paryāyasya bhāva-ktāntasyaivātra grahaṇāt.*

[145] In the impersonal sense √*jṝ*- (which is intransitive) would show a form with *ṇyat* as in *ajāryaṁ saṁgatena* mentioned by *PdM* (502) and *SK* (p. 483); but *ajārya*- is not attested in literature.

(For a discussion on the form *upacāyya-pṛḍa-* and its later development, efer to Obsn **49**, and on *pṛḍa-* see l. c., fn. 235.)

The form, *upaceya-pṛḍa-*, is, however, nowhere found attested in literature at any stage.

Obsn 10 : P. Kty, and Ptj, probably all, used the forms, *lavya-* and *pavya-*.

Ptj has frequently cited (cf. II.82.7) the Kṛtya-forms, *lavya-* " to be cut " and *pavya-* " to be cleansed etc. ", derived respectively from the roots, √*lū-* " to cut or reap " and √*pū-* " to cleanse or purify " with the suffix *yat* enjoyed after vowel-ending roots (by 3.1.97). There is also no reason to doubt the existence of these in the usage of P and Kty.[146]

The forms, therefore, show continuity of usage from P to Ptj; but they are not attested in literature.

Obsn 11 : (i) P and Kty used the from *āneya-* to denote a permanent object.
(ii) The author of a Śl-Vt and Ptj used it in a more extended context.

The form, *āneya-* " to be brought ", is regularly derived from *ā-* √*nī-* with the suffix *yat*. It is differentiated from the other form, *ānāyya-*, also derived from the same root with *ṇyat* and *āyādeśa*; and the cause of this differentiation in forms is differentiation in the senses they were supposed to convey.

It will be noted that, with P and Kty on the one hand and the auther of a Śl-Vt and Ptj on the other, there had been an enlarging of the sphere of the use of *āneya-*, with a corresponding narrowing down of that of *ānāyya-*. (Refer to Obsn **34** for the same.

Obsn 12 : (i) P and Kty may have used (in the etymological sense) the form *meya-* and perhaps *niceya-* also.
(ii) Ptj used both.

As counter-illustrations to the extra-ordinary formations, *pāyya-* and *nikāyya-* that were listed by P (3.1.129) in particular senses, Ptj has given the regular formations, *meya-* (from √*mā-*) and *niceya-* (from *ni*-√*ci-*) respectively, in the senses other than those noted in the extra-ordinary formations ('*anyatra*' II.89.13), i. e. in their natural or etymological senses of " to be measured" and "to be piled up " respectively. These forms were, of course, derived from the same roots as these in the earlier cases, but with the suffix *yat*.

---

[146] See fns. 188 and 189 at Obsn **32**.

There is no reason to doubt the knowledge and use of the simple form *meya-* on the part of P and Kty as it occurs in *AV*; and perhaps they used *niceya-* also which occurs in *MBhr.*

This, therefore, reflects a continuous usage from P to Ptj.

Obsn 13 : (i) P and Kty possibly used the form *ceya-*.

(ii) Ptj had the forms, *ceya-*, *ditsya-*, *dhitsya-* and *anubhavya-*, in his usage.

At different places Ptj has made reference to the following forms (derived with *yat*) which he must have noted from the usage of his time : *ceya-* "to be gathered" (II.78.11), *ditsya-*[147] "desired to be given" (I.483.15, II.82.8), *dhitsya-*[147] "desired to be supported" (I.483.15, II.82.9) and *anubhavya-* "to be accepted" (in the construction, *anubhavyam āmantraṇam* II.84.5-6).

Of these, *ceya-* occurs in *MBhr* (12.280.22), but probably not in the Veda; yet it is likely that P and Kty also knew and used this simple form. The other forms are not attested in literature.

Obsn 14: (i) P probably used the form, *gamya-*.

(ii) Kty probably and Ptj certainly used that.

(iii) Ptj used *gamyā-* and *agamyā-* in a particular context. Kty too probably used these.

By his general rule, *por ad-upadhāt* (3.1 98), P derived Kṛtya forms with the suffix *yat* from roots having *a* as their semifinal and a *p*-class consonant as the final. It is quite probable, therefore, that he thus derived *gamya-* "to be approached" from √*gam-*. It is further probable that Kty and Ptj too must be using the form derived from a root of such common occurrence.

Ptj has recorded it once in the sense of "to be understood" in a stanza that he has quoted (— cp. *api cātra ślokam udāharanti* II.124.11) in the Kṛt Section : *sūkṣmo hi bhāvo 'numitena gamyaḥ* (II.124.13).

He has further used it in one context (probably as a noun) in the feminine gender, independently and as compounded with the negative particle *a*, in a moral precept regulating a man's conduct in accordance with the prescriptions of the Law Books with which he is well familiar[148] : *samānaś ca kheda-vigamo gamyāyāṁ ca = a-gamyāyāṁ ca; tatra niyamaḥ kriyata : iyaṁ gamyā=iyam-a-gamyā= iti.* (I. 8. 7f.) *gamyā-* and *a-gamyā-* here mean a woman with whom cohabitation is either allowed or forbidden respectively, or literally " (a woman) who can (properly) be approached (with sexual desire)" and one not so respectively.

---

[147] The forms, according to Ptj, show *yat* by the rule *aco yat* (3.1.97) (on its interpretation) as being applicable to roots that were **also originally** vowel-ending. (*idaṁ tarhi prayajanam : ajanta-bhūtapūrvamātrād api yathā syāt,* II.82.6-7.)

[148] Vide his well-known reference to the Dharmasūtrakāra-s twice in *M* (I.115.1, II.365.23).

It is quite likely that Kty too used the two forms as he too shows familiarity with the ancient Law Code.[149] The same cannot be said about P with certainty.

gamya- " to be visited " and *a-gamya-* " difficult to be visited " are attested early in the two epics : *gamyāny api ca tīrthāni kīrtitāny agamāni ca* (*MBhr* 3.83.88); *ataḥ param a-gamyo' yaṁ parvataḥ sudurāruhaḥ* (o.c., 3.146.79); *a-gamyo mānuṣair dīptaḥ* (*dvīpaḥ*) (*Rām* 4. 40. 24). *a-gamyā-* " difficult to be visited " occurs in *MārkP* (82.64) : (*vasundharā*) *a-gamyā sā ' bhavat tatra yatrābhūt sa mahāraṇaḥ* (*Devī-māhātmya,* 2.64).

gamya- " that can be understood " occurs in *MBhr* and *Manu* : *jñānaṁ jñeyaṁ jñāna-gamyaṁ hṛdi sarvasya viṣṭhitam* (*BGītā* 13.17=*MBhr* 6.35.17); *svapnadhī-gamyam* (*Manu* 12.122).

The negative form, *a-gamyā-*, in the context of sexual approoch, occurs in *MBhr, a-gamyā-gamanam* (12.59.20) and *Manu,* (*pāpam*) *a-gamyā-gamanīyaṁ tu vratair ebhir apānudet* (11.169). In the same context, a masculine form, *a-gamya-*, too occurs in *MBhr* (*strīṇām a-gamyo loke ' smin nāsti kaścin mahāmune* 13.38 21; cp. also 16c there) and the *Kāmasūtra* of Vātsyāyana (6.1.16).

---

[149] Vide his respectful mention : *dharma-śāstraṁ ca tathā* (1.2.64.39).

<< 4 >> FORMS IN -*YA*$_2$ (*KYAP*)

(Sūtra-s : 3.1.106-123)

Obsn 15 : (i) P, Kty and Ptj, all, used compound forms ending in °*hátyā-* in the action sense;—which specific forms, it cannat be said definitely.

(ii) Ptj used specifically *dasyu-hátyā-* and *śva-hátyā-* of the type in the action sence.

P (3.1.108) lays down the suffix ***kyap*** in the action sense after ***√han-*** preceded by a Subanta as an Upapada. This would give the fem. form °*hatyā-* accented as °***hátyā-***.[150]

Kty (3.1.108. 1: ***hanas taś cit striyāṁ chandasi***) only brings out the final accent on the Vedic fem. form °*hatyā́-*[151] which P must have known but only did not note for some reason. Kty does not take exception to the secular use of °***hátyā-*** noted by P. Ptj retains the secular usage implied by Kty and even illustrates it with the forms, ***dasyuhátyā-*** "killing of a thief" and *śva-hátyā-* "killing of a dog", from connected secular usage: ***dasyu-hátyā*** (or) *śva-hátyā vartate* (II. 84.13, 7-8).

The forms, ***dasyu-*** and ***śvan-***, are of Vedic antiquity; and although P and Kty have referred only to the latter form in many of their rules, they must have known (and even used) the former also.[152] It is not very unlikely, therfore, that the compound-forms noted bv Ptj were also current in the times of P and Kty.

This suggests contiunity of the two usages, or at least that of the usage-type (ending in ***hátyā-***), in the times of P, Kty and Ptj.

The compounds are not attested in literature.

Obsn 16 : P, Kty and Ptj, probably all of them, used *stutya-* in the ordinary sense as well as in the sense of " to be **necessarily** praised."

P (*eti-stu-śāsu*[153]*-vṛ-dṛ-juṣaḥ kyap*, 3.1.109) derived the form, *stutya-* "to be praised ", from ***√stu-*** with the suffix ***kyap*** (and ***tug-āgama*** by 6.1.71). In the sense of "necessarily to be done" ('*āvaśyake dyotye*'), however, he shortly later enjoined the suffix *ṇyat* to derive forms from roots ending in *u* or *ū* only (*or āvaśyake*, 3.1.125).[154] By this, in the sense of "necessarily to be praised" we would be getting from √*stu*- the form, **stāvya*-. This **stāvya*-, however, was probably not found in the usages of P, Kty or Ptj, as it is not attested in early secular literature. The same conclusion is further indicated by P's including *stāvya*- in the list of a few irregular Kṛtya forms **peculiar only to the Veda** (3.1.123). — For this reason and in order to derive another form, *avaśya-stutya*-, Kty and Ptj have (in different ways) interpreted the *eti-stu°* rule as insisting upon the use of *kyap* after √*stu*- in any case, i.e ruling out the use of *ṇyat* after it **even in** the necessity sense.[155]

---

[150] By *gatikārakopapadāt kṛt* (6.2.139), *anudāttau suppitau* (3.1.4) and *anudāttaṁ padam ekavarjam* (6.1.158).

[151] By *citaḥ* (6.1.163), after having made the suffix *kyap* a *c-it*.

[152] The form *śvan-* is enumerated among the ready-made or irregular forms at *USū* 1.158; *dasyu-* too is derived by *USū* 3.20, *yaji-mani-śundhi-dasi-janibhyo yuc*.

[153] See KIELHORN : "there can be no doubt, that the right reading is °*śāsuvṛ*°," *IA* (1887) 16.179.

If their interpretation of the rule were accepted (—and the argument appears convincing —), we have to know that not only Kty and Ptj, but P also used *stutya*- itself in both the senses, the normal one as well as the other one of "necessarily to be praised."

Obsn 17: (i) P probably did not use the form, *avaśya-stutya*-.

(ii) Kty probably, and Ptj certainly, used it.

When P's rule, *or āvaśyake* (3.1 125), is understood to be enjoining the suffix *ṇyat* after *u*-/ *ū*-ending roots when they had the Upapada expressing necessariness ('*āvaśyake upapade*'), the root √*stu*- is singled out by Kty to be taking only the suffix *kyap* (and not *ṇyat*) by the law of the Superiority of the Former. (3.1.125.3 : *or āvaśyake ṇyataḥ stauteḥ kyap pūrva-vipratiṣiddham.*) So, as explained by Ptj, the form thus obtained from √*stu*- was *avaśya-stutya*- "to be necessarily praised".

If Ptj's interpretation of the Vt reflected the intention of the Vārttikakāra correctly[156] it can be said that Kty too had the form, *avaśya-stutya*-, in his usage. The same cannot be said about the usage of P as there in no evidence of the currency of such usages at his time.[157]

---

[154] This supersedes the general rule *kṛtyāś ca* (3.3.171), by which all the Kṛtya suffixes can be used in the sense of necessity.

[155] This conclusion has been arrived at by Ptj, first hesitatingly (— cp. another idea introduced in *athavā* etc., II.84.17-18 —) and next definitely (II. 89. 3-4), in the form of his inference of the purpose of repetition of the word '*kyap*' in the present rule, 3.1.109, even when it can be understood to be there by Anuvṛtti from its earlier occurrence at 3.1.106. (See : "*kyab iti vartamāne punaḥ kyab-grahaṇaṁ kim-artham*?" "*kyab eva yathā syād, yad anyat prāpnoti tan mā bhūd, iti.*" "*kiṁ cānyat prāpnoti*?" "*ṇyat. or āvaśyake*..." II.84.14-15.) So too *KV* (162: ...*punaḥ kyab-grahaṇaṁ bādhaka-bādhanārtham.*)

This rules out the earlier suggestion of Kty at 3.1.125.3 to arrive at the same decision by deriving help from the law of Superiority of the Former (Pūrvavipratiṣedha), here that of *kyap* from 3.1.109 over *ṇyat* from 3.1.125 after √*stu*-.

[156] For the two possible ways in which the Vt could be illustrated, see fn. 191 on Obsn **33.**

The form is not attested in literature.

Obsn 18: (i) P used the form *vṛtya-* and probably derived it form *vṛ(ñ)-*.

(ii) Kty and Ptj used it and derived it likewise.

P had a form *vṛtya-* which he sought to establish with *kyap* by the rule, *eti-stu-śāsu-vṛ-dṛ-juṣaḥ kyap* (3.1.109). But he did not make clear exactly which √*vṛ-*, whether *vṛñ* (*varaṇe, DhP* 1255) or *vṛṅ* (*saṁbhaktau, DhP* 1510), was at the base of this form. So Kty (Vt 1: *kyab-vidhau vṛñ-grahaṇam*) records that the √*vṛ-* in the present rule is to be understood as *vṛñ*. Acceptance of this suggestion enables us, according to Ptj, to disallow ('*iha mā bhūt*' II. 84.20) the form *vārya-* in the field of *kyabvidhi* and to hand it over properly to the *ṇyad-vidhi* (3.1.124). It was, therefore, obvious for Ptj that *vārya-* stemmed from *vṛṅ*[158]. — This decides the meaning for *vṛtya-*, "to be chosen," and that for *vārya-*, "to be presented with a gift"[159].

Now, this counter-illustration, *vārya-*, derived from *vṛṅ* is recorded by Ptj within the usage, *vāryā ṛtvijaḥ* (II. 84. 20), that appears to be a Vedic quotation and, as such, known to P. That means that the form, *vṛtya-*, formed by the present rule is derived by P also from *vṛñ*.

Thus, *vṛtya-* was probably current throughout the period from P to Ptj.

The from is not attested in literature.

Obsn 19: (i) P knew the common noun *ājya-* though he did not derive it.

(ii) Kty had it and he derived it from √*añj-* (without mentioning the Upasarga).

(iii) Ptj too had it and he derived it from *ā-* √*añj-*.

---

[157] See comments at the end of Obsn **33.**

[158] The rule mentioning *ṇyat* after √*vṛ-* and forming *vārya-*, viz. *īḍa-vanda-vṛ-śaṁsa-duhāṁ ṇyataḥ* (6.1.214), also, is silent about the particular √*vṛ-* intended there, in the absence of a symbolic letter attached there too. But, Kaiy (144 a) feels that the √*vṛ-* in that rule is to be supposed to be *ātmanepadin* owing to its close position with such roots, viz. √*īḍ-* and √*vand-*, and hence to be *vṛṅ;* and that, therefore, by elimination, the present root (deriving *vṛtya-*) is *vṛñ*. — It is surprising how this fact did not strike Ptj who usually discusses the propriety of a Vt giving an acceptable point, by looking for some authoritative indication (Jñāpaka) of the point from P himself, and rejects the Vt if such an indication were found (as here found by Kaiy).

[159] These are according to *DhP* 1255 and 1510 respectively. But there seem to be reasons to doubt this assignment of meanings on the grounds of usage.

P knew the noun *ājya-* " clarified butter " which occurred frequently in the Veda. But he left it underived. Obviously the root at the base was √*añj-*[160]. Kty too used the form; so he derived it from √*añj-* with *kyap* (3.1.109.2 : *añjeś copasaṁkhyānaṁ saṁjñāyām*). Ptj improved upon the derivation by adding the prefix *ā-* to the root[161]. He admonishes the Pada-kāra for not analysing *ājya-* thus (i. e. by separating *ā* and *ajyam* with an Avagraha mark in between)[162] and thereby upholds the superiority of the Theory of the science (Lakṣaṇa) of grammar over its Application by the Pada-kāra[163].

Now, an examination of this derivation is worthwhile as it might have a bearing on the history of usage.

Ptj's derivation is on the whole satisfactory: only, one presupposition is necessary to make it faultless. It is to be supposed that exactly from this Sūtra onwards the qualification *anupasarge* [164] is not to be received from 3.1.100, and that an Upasarga (like *ā*) has a green light before a root (like √*añj-*) [165].

Kty's derivation is justifiable on the same ground. He is usually seen to be all the more cautious before accepting an Anuvṛtti [166]. So, without otherwise justifying *ājya*-from √*ānj*–[167], he can easily forbid ***anupasarge*** in this rule and get the Upasarga *ā* before √*añj*-. —There is only one difficulty: why does he not mention this *ā*- in his note as he does elsewhere?[168] Was it really, it may be asked, the form **ajya*- that was in the mind of Kty to be derived by his Vt?

---

[160] (i) Resorting to the diversity(=Bāhulaka)-rule (*kṛtya-lyuṭo bahulam* 3.3.113), BhD has derived *ājya-* of the out-of-the-way instrumental sense (as "that with which one anoints") from √*añj-* (*DhP* 1459 *añjū...*) "to anoint" with *kyap*. (See *SK*, p. 483; *ŚabK* II. 408.)
(ii) BhD (*ŚabK* II. 408f.) further refutes the *PK* (II. 487) suggestion to derive it from √*aj-* (*DhP* 230 *aja gati-kṣepaṇayoḥ*) for which *ku-tva* is forbidden by 7.3.60.

[161] It can be seen that *kyap* is the only possible suffix in the form. For, (1) *ṇyat* (of the consonant-ending roots) is out of question, as it would not remove the nasal in the root and would give the form **aṅgya-* (with *ku-tva* by 7.3.52 and the Anta-svarita by 6.1.185); and (2) *kyap*, being a *k-it*, accounts for the loss of the penultimate nasal in the root (by *aniditāṁ hala upadhāyāḥ kṅiti*, 6.4.24). — But the difficulty with *kyap* is that, being a *k-it*, it disallows the Vṛddhi (by *kṅiti ca*, 1.1.5). That is why *ā-* is prefixed to the root by Ptj.

[162] According to *ŚabK* (II. 408) as in *ā́jyam* / from *ā́jyaṁ kím āsīt paridhíḥ ká āsīt* (which is *RV* 10.130.3b).

[163] *na lakṣaṇena padakārā anuvartyāḥ, padakārair nāma lakṣaṇam anuvartyam. yathā-lakṣaṇaṁ padaṁ kartavyam.* — II.84.4-5; exactly in the same words, twice again: III.117.14-19 (on 6.1.207.1), III.398.8-10 (on 8.2.16.5). It is supposed that the Pada-kāra may not always have a clear idea of the text and be sure of his analysis: cp. Kaiy (145 b), *yatrārthaniścayābhāvas tatrā~agraho na kriyate.*

[164] Whose Anuvṛtti was so obvious at 3.1.106 as to make Kty (3.1.106.1) worthy of a reproof from Ptj: *naitad anuvākhyeyam 'adhikārā anuvartanta' iti; eṣa eva nyāya yaduta=adhikārā anuvarterann iti.* — II.84.1-2.

[165] This is the view of *KV* (162): *'supy anupasarge bhāva' iti nivṛttam. sāmānyena etat.*

[166] For which over-cautiousness he had to pay at 3.1.106.1.

Obsn 20: P, Kty and Ptj, all, used the form ***kheya***- derived from √***khan***-.

Ptj's discussion on the Sūtra (3.1.111) deriving the form ***kheya***- " to be dug out " from √***khan***- with ***kyap*** has no bearing either on the form or on its meaning, which are accepted without dissent by all.

The form is of frequent occurrence in the Veda, but not in the later literature in the adjectival sense.

Obsn 21: (i) P knew the forms, *saṁbhṛtya*- and *saṁbhārya*-; but he did not derive the latter.

(ii) Kty and Ptj used them and derived them from *sam*- √*bhṛ*-.

The forms, *saṁbhṛtya*- and *saṁbhārya*- " to be put together " occur frequently in the Veda: and P must have known them, though he did not derive the latter as an adjective. Probably it escaped his notice.

Of the two, *saṁbhṛtya*- is easily derived with ***kyap*** by ***bhṛño ' saṁjñāyām*** (3.1.112); but *saṁbhārya*-, in the same (adjectival) sense and yet showing ***ṇyat***, is not formed regularly by a rule of P. So Kty lays down a rule (3.1.112.4 : *samaś*[169] *ca bahulam*) stating that when √*bhṛ*- is preceded by *sam*- it shows diversity (in the application of the suffixes). Thereby, according to Ptj, he implies sanction to the regular form showing the suffix ***kyap*** by 3.1.112 (i.e. *sambhṛtya*-) as well as to the irregular from showing the suffix ***ṇyat*** (i.e. ***saṁbhārya***-). The fact that Kty does not restrict his note to the Vedic literature (as at 3.1. 108.1 : ***hanas taś cit striyāṁ chandasi***) probably points to the currency of the forms in his usage also; and the same can be said of Ptj for the same reason.

Ptj illustrates the forms in the connected usage as : ***saṁbhṛtyā eva saṁbhārāḥ*** ;***saṁbhāryā eva sambhārāḥ*** (II.86.14). Actually, the first of these two usages given by Ptj is found to be a quotation (viz. ***saṁbhṛtyā evá saṁbhārā́ḥ***) from *TS* (1.5 2.4), *MS* (1.7.2) *KāṭhS* (8.15) etc. It has not been possible tc trace the second one.

---

[167] In such ways as
(1) either (a) making *kyap* a *ṇ-it* (in the way he has added extra *it*-s at 3.1.96.2, 3.1.108.1 and 3.2.38.3) to secure Vṛddhi, or (b) likewise making *ṇyat* a *k-it* to secure *nalopa* (and then Vṛddhi and *kutvābhāva*); or
(2) stating √*añj*- as an exception either (a) to *kṅiti* at 1.1.5 (to secure Vṛddhi before *kyap* here), or (b) to *ñṇiti* at 7.2.116 (getting Vṛddhi here even with *kyap*), or (c) to *kṅiti* at 6.4.24 getting *nalopa* here even with *ṇyat*) and to 7.3.52 (to get *kutvābhāva* before *ṇyat* here).

[168] *āgameḥ kṣamāyām* (1.3.21.2), *āṅi nu-pracchyoḥ* (1.3.21.6), *śili-kāmi-bhakṣyācaribhyo ṇaḥ* etc. (3.2.1.7), *dārāv āhano 'ṇ antyasya ca ṭaḥ saṁjñāyām* (3.2.49.1). Note, however, that *KV* has redrafted our Vt as *āṅpūrvād añjeḥ saṁjñāyām upasaṁkhyānam.*

[169] Should be *'sami'*; cp. 3.2.49.3.

Neither of the forms seems to occur in classical Sanskrit.

Obsn 22 : (i) P lists ***sūrya-*** and ***rucya-*** as extraordinary forms.

(ii) Kty brings out their agent sense which must have been obvious to P at least in ***sūrya-*** though he did not note it.

(iii) The usage was acceptable to scholars in the period intervening between Kty and Ptj, and to Ptj.

The form *sūrya-* cannot be had from √*sṛ-* by ***ṛ-halor ṇyat*** or from √*sū-* by *aco yat*; and the form *rucya-* cannot be had from √*sṛ-* by ***ṛ-halor ṇyat***. So P (3.1.114) listed them inter alia as irregular forms with ***kyap***.

Another point of speciality in their case was, however, forgotten by P. *sūrya-*, derived either from √*sṛ-* (*saraṇād vā, M* II.86.19) to mean " one who (constantly) moves (in the sky) " or from √*sū-* (*suvati vā karmaṇi, M* loc. cit.) to mean "one who spurs (beings or creation) to activity "[170], gives the agent sense (as against the object or action sense common with the Kṛtya-forms); similarly does *rucya-* (*rocate 'sau, M* loc. cit.) " that which shines or pleases ". This point was noted by Kty in his Vt (3.1.114.1 : *sūrya-rucya = avyathyāḥ kartari*); while the etymology for *sūrya* was stated by a Kārikā-kāra (quoted by Ptj) who probably succeeded Kty, thus : *sū-sartibhyāṁ sarter utvaṁ suvater vā suḍāgamaḥ* (II.86.18).[171]

However, as it is obvious that the form *sūrya-* might not have differed in meaning at the time of Ptj, it can be taken that P simply missed to note the agent significance in it. As such, the form ***rucya-***, but not *sūrya-*, may be said to constitute a history in its significance to generations earlier than Kty or later than P.

The from ***rucya-*** appears to occur only late in *Naiṣadh* (8.28).

Obsn 23 : (i) P lists *a-vyathya-* as an extraordinary form.

(ii) Kty brings out the agent sense in it which may have been obvious to P also.

(iii) The usage was acceptable to Ptj.

---

[170] Cp. *Ny* (510) : *kārye lokān preryati=iti. tasmin hy udite lokasya kriyā-pravṛttiḥ.*

[171] The etymology is probably earliest given in *Nir* and then in *BD*. See : *Nir* 12.14 (p. 211), *sūryaḥ sarter vā, suvater vā; svīryater vā; and BD* 7.128 B (p. 89), (p. 211), *sūryaḥ sarter vā, suvater vā, svīryater vā*; and *BD* 1.128 B (p. 89),

sūryaḥ sarati bhūteṣu su vīrayati tāni vā /
su īryatvāya yāty eṣu sarvakāryāṇi saṁdadhat //

vyathya- from the compound, *a-vyathya-* " not feeling pain, unaffected, unshakable ", cannot be had by *ṛ-halor ṇyat* with *ṇyat* (causing the Vṛddhi). So P (3.1.114) listed it as one of the irregular forms with *kyap.*

The speciality of the agent sense in the form (*na vyathate ' vyathyaḥ, M* II.86.19–20) was brought out by Kty (3.1.114.1 : supra), though it must have been apparent to P also who must have known the form from the Veda (*RV* 2.35.5 : *a-vyathyá-* etc.) and perhaps used it so.

Hence it has to be said that the speciality was an old feature, and that it may have shown continuity in the usages of P, Kty and Ptj.

The form is not attested in classical literature.

Obsn 24 : (i) P used the form *kupya-* probably deriving it from √*kup-*.

(ii) *MBhr* showed *kupya-*, probably once as a noun derived from √*gup-*, and once as an adjective derived from √*kup-*.

(iii) Kty used the noun *kupya-* derived from √*gup-*.

(iv) Ptj's usage agreed with that of Kty.

P (3.1.114) has listed *kupya-* among a few irregular forms. One point of irregularity in it is the absence of Guṇa. So it is said to be showing the Guṇa-denying suffix *kyap*, instead of *ṇyat* (which the root should have ordinarily taken, as in the form *kopya-* cited in *KV* 160) by P's rule, *ṛ-halor ṇyat* (3.1.124), deriving Kṛtya-forms from consonant-ending roots.

But Kty (3.1.114.2 : *kupyaṁ saṁjñāyām*) noticed that the irregular form was used only as a name (Saṁjñā).

Kty's restriction of *kupya-* (showing *kyap*) suggested that when not conveying a name, the same root that was at the base of *kupya-* would derive a form with *ṇyat* : thus, if the root were supposed to be √*kup-*, the non-name form would be *kopya-*.

But Ptj's gloss indicates that *kupya-* was derived by him from √*gup-*" " to preserve or protect ", when it would mean " to be preserved ", and then, as a common noun, " an object to be preserved ." (According to this derivation the form *kupya-* showed an additional irregularity of *ka-tva.*[172]) For, the counter-formation supplied by him (when not meaning a name) was the adjective *gopya-* " to be protected " (*gopyam anyat* II. 86. 22), as it was without these two peculiarities and was derived from the same root √*gup-* with the addtion of *ṇyat.* This seems to reflect Kty's position correctly; for, a form derived from √*kup-* cannot yield a Saṁjñā.

---

[172] It should be noted here that a similar case of seeing the devoicing of an earlier *g* within a current form with *k* is found suggested in *M* in the form *śaṁkarā-;* but that was done by Kuṇaravāḍava who probably lived after Kty and before Ptj. See Obsn **72** in this connection.

The earliest attestation of the name or noun *kupya-* appears to be in *MBhr* (15. 11. 10):

hiraṇyaṁ kupya-bhūyiṣṭhaṁ mitraṁ kṣiṇam akośavat /
viparītān na gṛhṇīyāt svayaṁ saṁdhiviśāradaḥ //

Other occurrences of *kupya-* as a name are found in *Manu* (7. 96, 10. 113, 11.66), *KauArth* (1. 16. 29; 2. 17. 1, 17, Gl. 31) and the *Mṛcchakaṭika.* While in *KauArth* it means "the forest produce", at other places the meaning of "a kind of base metal" probably suits well. *gopya-* also is found occurring in *MBhr.* (See Obsn **46.**)

From Kty's remark and Ptj's comment on it they do not seem to be aware of an adjective *kupya-* "to be excited" and containing only one point of irregularity (viz. the absence of Guṇa), but not showing *katva* derived from √*kup-*. But in this sense *kupya*- is found attested in *MBhr* itself. (See : *kopasthāneṣv api mahatsv a-kupyaṁ na kadācana,* 15.38.3 cd.) — That leads necessarily to a suspicion that P might as well have had before him an adjective *kupya-* "to be excited" derived from √*kup-* and showing only one point of irregularity. (— And we cannot also be definite that his Nipātana referred, at a time, to more than one factor of irregularity.—) His silence about the Saṁjñā nature of *kupya-* lends weight to this suspicion. Further, *kopya-* (in the primary sense) from √*kup-* was in no case possible according to him and that is corroborated by non-attestation of *kopya-* (in the primary sense) in literature (except at *KV* 160), and by its attestation probably from (the causal of) the Vedic √*kup-* in the form *akopya-* "immovable" (for which *BHSDi* s.v.).

All this leads to the following inferences :

(1) P's *kupya-*, not restricted to being a Saṁjñā, could be taken to the derived from √*kup-*.

(2) The *MBhr kupya-*, once (15.38.3) an objective based on √*kup-* (as P used), and once (15.11.10) a name probably based on √*gup-*, marked the next or transitional stage in linguistic development. (*gopya-* also was current then.)

(3) Kty's *kupya-*, conveying only a name and hence derived from √*gup-*, may suggest prevalence of the next stage, when at the same time the (*MBhr*) *kupya-* derived from √*kup* had fallen out of usage.

(4) Ptj's usage contiuned to be the same as Kty's.

Obsn 25 : (i) P had the form, *kṛṣṭa-pácya-*, (probably so accented) in his usage.

(ii) Kty and Ptj brought out its obvious reflexive force, and probably used it as *kṛṣṭa-pacyá-* besides finding it so accented in the Veda.

The form, *kṛṣṭa-pacya-* "ripening of itself in cultivated ground", derived from *√pac-* having the Upapada *kṛṣṭa-*, shows *kyap* instead of *ṇyat* (enjoined by 3.1.124 after consonant- ending roots); hence P (3.1.114) lists it as one of the extraordinary forms under *kyap*. That suggests that the form showed the accent as *kṛṣṭa-pácya-*[173] in his usage.

Kty adds a note on this (3.1.114.3. : *kṛṣṭapacyasya = antodāttatvaṁ ca karma-kartari ca*) to bring out [174] its reflexive force [175] and the final accent in the form as *kṛṣṭa-pacyá-*. Actually, the form is found to occur with this accent peculiarity (and probably with the reflexive force also) in the Saṁhitā texts of the Veda[176]. That indicates that Kty by his note intended to refer to the Vedic occurrence of the form, as he thought P to have forgotten to note the peculiarities contained in it there.

But, it must be remembered that P was not here referring to the Vedic usage. Had it been in his mind to do that, he would have qualified his rule with the expression, '*chandasi*', as he does shortly later at *chandasi niṣṭarkya°* .... (3.1.123). that shows that he was referring only to the usage of his time. The reflexive force in the form must be too well-known and common in the usage and probably because of this he did not think it necessary to mention it specially.

Further, the fact that Kty too did not restrict his note to the Veda with the word '*chandasi*,' (as he does he when he wants to pinpoint a phenomenon to the Veda[177]) should suggest that he too was referring to the accentual peculiarity in the form either as it was used in his time or as it should be used according to him.

Ptj illustrates the point of the Vt with *kṛṣṭa-pacyā́ś ca me*; *ákṛṣṭa-pacyā́ś ca me*[178] (II.86.25) which can be traced to the Saṁhitā-s of the Veda with the same accent on the form as noted by Kty.[179] That points out either that he understood Kty's note to be valid for the Veda alone, or, more possibly, that he understood it to be uniformly applicable to the Vedic and secular languages but had difficulty in giving an example from the secular usage. That he does not expressly restrict its scope to the Veda suggests that he had no objection to its use in the secular language.

---

[173] By *gatikārakopapadāt kṛt* (6.2.139) and *anudāttau sup-pitau* (3.1.4).

[174] Explained by Ptj as : *kṛṣṭe pacyante svayam eva* (II.86.24).

[175] This is by way of an exception to Kty's non-acceptance of the reflexive force in the Kṛtya formations : compare his Vt 6, *tatra lāntasya karmavad-anudeśaḥ*, and Vt 7, *itarathā hi kṛtya-ktakhalartheṣu pratiṣedhaḥ*, on P's rule, *karmavat karmaṇā tulyakriyaḥ* (3.1.87).

[176] The edition of *TMBr* wherein also the form occurs (6.9.9, p. 385) does not give an accented text.

[177] Cp. 3.1.108.1 : *hanas taś cit striyāṁ chandasi*.

[178] It may be noted, however, that the second bit of the line (*akṛ°* ....) is dropped in the MSS A E g B according to the critical apparatus supplied by KIELHORN.

[179] *kṛṣṭa-pacyā́ś ca me; akṛṣṭa-pacyā́ś ca me* : *VS* 18.14 (p. 567), *MS* 2.11.5 (p. 192), *VS*(*K*) 19.5.2 (p. 81).

In the classical literature, *kṛṣṭa-pacya-* is probably first attested in *BhāgP* (7.12.18) as *na kṛṣṭapacyam aśnīyād akṛṣṭaṁ cāpy akālataḥ/* (p.61); *a-kṛṣṭa-pacya-* is seen in *MBhr* as *akṛṣṭapacyā pṛthivī vibabhau caityamālinī/* (12.29.13), *akṛṣṭapacyā pṛthivī tavaiśvarye babhūva ha/* (12.216.16).

Obsn 26 : (i) P used the forms, *pratigṛhya-* and *apigṛhya-*.

(ii) Kty and Ptj instead used *pratigrāhya-* and *apigrāhya-* respectively.

P had in his usage the forms, *pratigṛhya-* "to be accepted" and *apigṛhya-* "to be received with a closure (of the mouth, nose etc., or secretly)", which showed the suffix *kyap*. This constitutes an exception to his general rule for consonant-ending roots, *ṛ-halor ṇyat* (3.1.124, according to which the root √*grah-* at the base here should take the suffix *ṇyat*, and the forms then derived would be ending in $_k$*rāhya-* with the Vṛddhi). Hence P frames a special rule (3.1.118 : *praty-apibhyāṁ graheḥ*) to account for the forms, *pratigṛhya-* and *apigṛhya-*, being without the Vṛddhi and showing Saṁprasāraṇa (that is enjoined by 6.1.16 before a *kit* suffix).

Kty, however, notes (3.1.118.1 : *praty-apibhyāṁ graheś chandasi*) that he found (P's) *pratigṛhya-* and *apigṛhya-* used in the Vedic literature (only).[180] That implies, as is pointed out by Ptj, that in the secular usage ('*anyatra*', II. 87.4) Kty noticed the forms, *pratigrāhya-* and *apigrāhya-*, as derived by the general rule. At the time of Ptj the situation remained the same as with Kty.

This suggests that at the time of P *pratigṛhya-* and *apigṛhya-* were found both in the Vedic[181] as well as in the secular languages, but that later at the time of Kty they were restricted to the Vedic literature, the secular usage having then developed the new forms, *pratigrāhya-* and *apigrāhya-*.

Pratigrāhya- is attested in the *ĀGSū* (3. 6. 9), *BDhSū* (2.38), *VDhSū* (5.9), *Manu* (11.253), *MBhr* (13. 94. 25, 14, 56. 11f.) and *Rām* (648*, 1.8, after 4.33.6). But *apigrāhya-* is not attested.

---

[180] The author of *KV*, on the basis of this Vt of Kty, takes liberty with the rule of P and includes this idea in the rule itself by adding *chandasi* in it. This has been rightly fought by the traditions. (See *TattvaB* on *SK* 2869, 3.1.118 : *vṛttikṛtā tu sūtre prakṣiptam.* Even *PdM* at another place (495) criticises the author of *KV* for this, thus : *vicitrā hi vṛtteḥ kṛtir vṛttikāreṇa.*)

[181] The Vedic quotations of Ptj, *mattasya na pratigṛhyam, anṛtaṁ hi matto vadati* and *tasmān nāpigṛhyam,* have been traced by THIEME (*P&V*, 16) to *KāṭhS* (14.5, 27.3 respectively).

Addenda to << 4 >>

(Formations by the Sūtra 3. 1.110.)

Obsn 27 : (i) P probably had the form *sṛjya-* derived from √*sṛj-* without or with any prefix (i. e. had even *sam-ava-sṛjya* -); and if at all he had any compound ending in a *ya-* ending Kṛtya form from √*sṛj-*, the compound ended probably only in *sṛjya-*.

(ii) Kty and Ptj used *sṛjya-*, but not *sam-ava-sṛjya-* or **pāṇi-sṛjya-*; they might have had other forms ending in *sṛjya-*.

It is likely that P used the form, *sṛjya* - " to be created", which could be derived from the root √*sṛj-* (occurring four times in his rules) by his general rule, 3. 1. 110 (for which, see Obsn **28** : similarly he might also have had in his usage the form, *sam-ava-sṛjya-* " to be let go ",[182] too which is attested in *AiBr* (4.13). It is possible that he had also Upapada-compounds ending in *sṛjya-* though evidence about that is not found.

Kty and Ptj seem to be using *sṛjya-* as such and as one prefixed by any Upasarga other than the combination *sam-ava-* or by any Upapada other than *pāṇi-*; for their language did not allow the use of *sṛjya-* in these two constructions (viz. *sam-ava-sṛjya-* and **pāṇi-sṛjya-*). (— For the usages of their times, see Obsns **28**, **29**.)

sṛjya- is of frequent occurrence in *BhāgP* (6th cent. A.D.[183]); **pāṇi-sṛjya-* is not attested; and *sam-ava-sṛjya-* not in Classical Sanskrit.

---

[182] "To be let off together", according to Martin HAUG (p. 191).

[183] R. C. HAZRA, *Studies in the Purāṇic Records on Hindu Rites and Customs*, Dacca, 1940, p. 55.

<< 5 >> FORMS IṆ -*YA*$_3$ (*ṆYAT*)

(Sūtra-s : 3.1.124-132)

Obsn 28 : (i) It is not known if P had in his usage the form **pāṇi-sṛjya-*; most probably he did not use *pāṇi-sargya-*.

(ii) Kty and Ptj used the form, *pāṇi-sargya-*.

By his general rule, *ṛd-upadhāc ca=a-kḷpi-cṛteḥ* (3.1.110), P derived the Kṛtya forms from roots having *r* as their penultimate (excepting √*kḷp-* and √*cṛt-*) by the addition of *kyap* that forbid the Guṇa and Vṛddhi (by 1.1.5). So he might have used *sṛjya-*, derived from √*sṛj-* (known to him), uniformly i.e. with or without a preceding Upasarga or Upapada. —But even with this general possibilily and even though a particular form like *pāṇi-* is known to be of frequent occurrence in the Veda and used by himself four times, it cannot be said definitely that he used even such a known form (cf. *pāṇi-*) as an Upapada to *sṛjya-*. So it cannot be positively stated that he used a form like **pāṇi-sṛjya-*.

Kty (3.1.124.1 : *pāṇau sṛjer ṇyad-vidhiḥ*), however, detected in his usage one compound-form, *pāṇi-sargya-* "that can be released with the hands", showing a Guṇa (and probably also the Anta-svarita), when √*sṛj-* was preceded by the Upapada *pāṇi-*. P's non-derivation of this form points to its absence in his usage. Further, Kty's note suggests that if at all he had in his usage other compounds ending in a Kṛtya form from √*sṛj-*, the Kṛtya form was generally *sṛjya-*, and that only in the solitary instance of *pāṇi-sṛjya-* it was *sargya-*.

Ptj retains the same peculiarity of usage and he records, by way of illustration, the phrase, *pāṇi-sargyā rajjuḥ* (II.88.7).

The form, *pāṇi-sargya-*, however, is found nowhere attested in literature.

Obsn 29 : (i) P probably used the form, *sam-ava-sṛjya-*.

(ii) Kty and Ptj used *sam-ava-sargya-* instead.

It has been seen above (Obsn 27) that P probably used the form, *sam-ava-sṛjya-*, derived from *sam-ava-* √*sṛj-*.

But Kty noticed in his usage the Kṛtya form (similarly derived), *sam-ava-sargya-* " to be let go or be abandoned ", showing a Guṇa and probably the Antasvarita. So he includes it under forms taking the suffix *ṇyat* (3.1.124.2 : *sam-ava-pūrvāc ca*).

Ptj accepts the note of Kty and explains it with the form, *sam-ava-sargya-*; that indicates that, according to the tradition handed down to him from Kty, '*sam-ava*' stood for the Upasarga-s *sam-* and *ava-* taken together and probably in the same order. This is corroborated by the fact that the forms *ava-sargya-saṁ-sargya-* and *ava-saṁ-sargya-* are not attested in literature (though *saṁ-sarga-* is of common occurrence in early literature, and *ava-sarga-* is found in the *nyaṅkvādi-gaṇa* at 7. 3. 53).

The form, *sam-ava-sargya-*, however, is not found attested in the literature.

Obsn 30 : (i) P probably did not intend to derive the form **lapya-* from √*lap-*; whether he derived *lāpya-* is not known.

(ii) Kty used not **lapya-* but *lāpya-*, and perhaps *apalāpya-* also.

(iii) Ptj used *apalāpya-* rather than *lāpya-*.

By his general rule, *por ad-upadhāt* (3.1 98), P would have the formations with the suffix *yat* from roots having as their final a consonant from the *p*-class, and as their semifinal the vowel *a*. Thus he would have **lapya-* "to be spoken" normally derived from √*lap-*. However, **lapya-* is not known to the Veda; but other forms from √*lap-* are of common occurrence in it. So a root which was thus well known to *P* could have easily given a Kṛtva form to the language of his times. But non-attestation of **lapya-* in the post-vedic as well as Vedic Sanskrit suggests that he did not intend to derive that form from √*lap-*.

That makes us consider a note on the root from Kty as probably reflecting the usage of P himself, and not as a later or historical development seen by the time of Kty. The note, *lapi-dabhibhyāṁ ca* (3.1.124.3),[184] added on the rule, *ṛ-halor ṇyat* (3.1.124), states that the Kṛtva form from √*lap-* was to be had with the addition of *ṇyat* that brings in the Vṛddhi; and the form thus had was *lāpya-* "to be spoken". It would thus seem that P did not derive it simply out of oversight although he probably used it and not **lapya-* that could be derived by his earlier rule.

Kty's note is probably to be interpreted as a general one for √*lap-*, i e. as establishing a form from the root either without or with the addition of an Upasarga.

Ptj's times had retained the usage of Kty and, by way of illustrating the Vt, he cited (not *lāpya-* but) the form *apalāpya-* "to be explained away or denied" (v.l. *avalāpya-* "to be spoken ill of or in the absence of"). That should suggest that he used *lāpya-* very rarely. (See fn. 186.)

---

[184] The author of *KV*, in his usual manner, includes this Vt-mention of *lapi* within one of the Sūtra-s itself (3.1.126 : *āsu-yu-vapi°* ......) falling under the sphere of *ṇyat*. However, such a textual liberty with the rules of P is strongly opposed by traditionists. (See *TattvaB* on *SK* 2887, 3.1.126).

Neither *lāpya-* nor *apalāpya-* (nor even *avalāpya-*) is found attested in literature.

Obsn 31 : (i) P knew the form *dābhya-* though he did not derive it; he probably did not intend to derive **dabhya-* also.

(ii) Kty used not **dābhya-* but *dābhya-* and perhaps also *avadābhya-*.

(iii) Ptj used *avadābhya-* rather than *dābhya-*.

By way of an exception to P's general rule, *por ad-upadhāt* (3.1.98), √*dabh-*[185] " to injure" is found to give the Kṛtya form, *dābhya-* "to be injured", with *ṇyat*. The form, **dabhya-*, which P would have derived with *yat* (by 3.1.98), is not attested in literature. On the contrary, the form *dābhya-* compounded with the privative particle *a-*, i.e. *a-dābhya-*, occurs frequently in the Veda. Hence P must have noted it (and not intended to derive **dabhya-*). Still for some reason he did not specifically indicate the derivation of *dābhya-*. So it was left to Kty to take note of the formation (*lapi-dabhibhyāṁ ca,* (3.1.124.3). Here too Kty's mention of the root appears to be understood as of a general nature, i.e. as probably sanctioning forms without as well as with an Upasarga.

Ptj had retained the usage of Kty; but in illustration of his Vt he has recorded not *dābhya-* but *avadābhya-*[186] " to be injured below (the hilt) ". That suggests that he probably used *dābhya-* rarely.

avadābhya- is not found attested in literature; nor *dābhya-* in classical literature.

Obsn 32 : P, Kty and Ptj, all, used the forms, *lāvya-* and *pāvya-*.

Kṛtya froms, *lavya-* and *pavya-*, derived with *yat* by a general rule (3.1.97) have been noted. (See Obsn **10.**) Further, the Kṛtya forms in the sense of necessity, when derived only from *u-/ū-*ending roots, (— see fn. 154—) were noted by P to be showing Vṛddhi in the final vowel of the root; so by way of an exception to 3.1.97, he derived these with *ṇyat* by his rule, *or āvaśyake* (3.1.125).

Here Kty introduces a discussion as to the interpreation of the Sūtra,—whether the word '*āvaśyaka*' in the rule bears reference to " the sense of necessariness (indicated by the suffix) " ('*āvaśyake dyotye*') or to " (the presence of) an Upapada carrying the sense of necessariness " ('*āvaśyaka*

---

[185] See *SK* 2885 (after 7.3.69) : *dabhir dhātuṣv apaṭhito 'pi vārttika-balāt svīkāryaḥ.* Cf. also *Ny* and *PdM* on 3.1.126.

[186] For this and for *apalāpya-*, see for similar cases our remarks at **81.** *śyenottha-* etc., **98.** *uṣṭra-praṇāya-* and **100.** *sukha-pratīkṣa-*.

upapade'). The discussion seems to favour acceptance by Kty as well as by Ptj of both the interpretations

Thus, according to the interpretation of '*āvaśyaka*'[187] as '*dyotya*', we get from √*lū*- and √*pū*- the Kṛtya forms 'in the sense of necessity' to be *lāvya*- "to be necessarily cut" and *pāvya*- "to be necessarily cleansed" respectively.

As the two roots were well known to P[188] and to Kty,[185] there is reason to believe that they had the two forms in their usage, although they are not found attested in the Vedic or classical Sanskrit literature. Ptj has used them once, in explaining the present rule (II.88.16).

The forms, therefore, can be taken to show contiunity of usage from P to Ptj.

Obsn 33 : (i) P probably did not use the Kṛtya forms compounded with *avaśya*- as the first member.

(ii) Kty used such forms.

(iii) Ptj used among such, *avaśya-lāvya*-, *avaśya-pāvya*-, *avaśya-bhāvya*-, (*avaśya-stutya*- with *yat*), and perhaps more such also.

According to the interpretation of the word '*āvaśyaka*' from the Sūtra, *or āvaśyake* (3.1.125), as standing for '*āvaśyaka upapada*' i.e. "(the presence of) an Upapada carrying the sense of necessariness", we get from √*lū*- and √*pū*- the Upapada-compound forms, *avaśya-lāvya*- "to be necessarily cut" and *avaśya- pāvya*- "to be necessarily cleansed". The Upapada bearing the necessity sense, here, is *avaśyam* that is an indeclinable[190] of which the final *m* is dropped in compound with a following Kṛtya form by Kty's Vt, *avaśyamaḥ kṛtye* (6.1.144.3 at III. 95.8).

The Vt of Kty just referred to points to the usage of such compounds in his times. Further, from Ptj's gloss on the discussion about the interpretation of the word '*āvaśyaka*' in the Sūtra, it appears that in his usage also such compounds were common or perhaps even much common.[191] He has used the forms, *avaśya-lāvya-* and *avaśya-pāvya-*, not only in the present instance (II.89.1), but at two other places also (I.121.18, III.54.13). Not only that, he has given us two more forms beginning with *avaśya* (*m*)-, viz. *avaśya-bhāvya-* " to have necessarily become " on Kty's Vt above (III 95.9) and *avaśya-stutya-* (II.89.2) that was discussed above.[192] However, none of the forms is attested in literature.

---

[187] Here and at 3.3.170, cp. *KV* : *avaśyaṁbhāva 'āvaśyakam'*. At both these places, *Ny and PdM* derive the word with *manojñāditvād vuñ* (by 5.1.133). But *avaśya*- is not found in the reconstruction of the Gaṇa by BIRWE (345).

[188] Cp. √*lū*- *at* 3.1.149, 3.2.184 and 3.3.28, and √*pū*- at 3.2.183, 185, 3.3.28, 49, and 8.4.34.

[189] Cp. √*lū*- at 3.1.149.1 and √*pū*- at 8.2.44.3.

[190] Being included in the *svar-ādi* Ākṛti-gaṇa of 1.1.37.

(The compounding in all these cases is said[193] to take place according to the rule, *mayūravyaṁsakādayaś ca* (2.1.72), in case only the *dyotya* interpretation of '*āvaśyaka*' were accepted that gave difficulty to their formation as an Upapada-compound. No difficulty in the accent of the compounds is also feared by Ptj.[193] With the suffix *ṇyat*, here too the forms can bear Nitya-svarita on the final syllable by 6.1.185.)

An instance of such compounding, *avaśya-kārya-* " what is to be necessarily done " is found early in *MBhr*, in a line that is repeated twice at different places : *te kṛtvā 'vaśya-kāryāṇi* (1.210.15, 8.1.10). — Now, this form, *avaśya-kārya-*, is found included in the *mayūravyaṁsakādi-gaṇa*. This, together with its occurrence in *MBhr*, can suggest that Ptj was aware of the form. In the *Brahma-Sūtra* 3.4.27 occurs the form *avaśyānuṣṭheya-tva-* (with *yat*); and later in the *Kāmandakīya-Nītisāra* 16.18 is found *avaśyayātavya-tā-* (with *tavya*). However, currency of such compounds in the usage of P cannot be taken for granted; for, they are unknown to the Saṁhitā and the Brāhmaṇa portions of the Veda.

Obsn 34 : (i) P uses the from *āṇāyya-* as qualifying any impermanent object, and *āneya-* for else, both derived from *ā* √*nī-*.

---

[191] For, when Ptj glosses on Vt 3 here that points out, in the case of √*stu-*, prevalence of the law of the Superiority of the Former or Pūrva-viparatiṣedha (viz. here that of *kyap* from 3.1.109 over *ṇyat* from 3.1.125), the examples he cites there are as follows :—

(a) for the Avakāśa of *ṇyat* by 3.1.125 : *avaśya-lāvya-*, *avaśya-pāvya-* (and not the bare forms, *lāvya-*, *pāvya-*); — This favours the *āv°* Upapada interpretation of the Sūtra.

(b) for the Avakāśa of *kyap* by 3.1.109 : *stutya-;*

(c) for the Avakāśa of both simultaneously but the Pūrvaviparatiṣedha showing *kyap* : *avaśya-stutya-* (ruling out **avaśva-stāvya-*)

Here Ptj could as well have given the following in illustration of the same law :— for (a) : *lāvya-;* for (b) : *stutya-;* and for (c) : *stutya-* (ruling out **stāvya-*). — This would have favoured the *āv°* *dyotya* interpretation of the Sūtra. That he does not do so suggests preponderence in his usage of forms with *avaśya-* as the first member.

[192] See Obsn **17.**

[193] Cp. *M* (II. 88.20) : *mayūravyaṁsakāditvāt samāso vispaṣṭādivat svaro bhaviṣyati.*

(ii) The author of a Śl-Vt restricts the use of *ānāyya-* to the Dakṣiṇāgni of a particular type, and uses *āneya-* to qualify all that remains.

(iii) Ptj's usage agrees with that from the Śl-Vt

P (3.1.127 *ānāyyo ' nitye*) used the extraordinary form, *ānāyya-* "to be brought near" (with *ṇyat* and *āy-ādeśa*), in respect of any impermanent object;[194] and by implication, he used *āneya-* (with *yat*) in the case of permanent objects.

In a brief note on the Sūtra of P, there is first a Vārttika from Ptj (*dakṣiṇāgnāv iti vaktavyam*) that restricts the situations using *ānāyya-*; there is also supplied next the counter-illustration of *āneya-* in other situations. This is followed by a Śl-Vt that further narrows down the situations for *ānāyya-*.

Thus the Vt of Ptj appears not to allow the use of *ānāyya-* with any and every impermanent object but with the impermanent Dakṣiṇāgni only (which is not constantly lit), and would allow the use of *āneya-* with other impermanent objects (such as *ghaṭa*) besides the permanent objects. The Śl-Vt wants to restrict *ānāyya-* further with only that particular Dakṣiṇāgni "which has the same source" (in common with the Āhavanīya fire, i.e. the Gārhapatya fire from which both are brought); this allows the use of *āneya-* with other kinds of Dakṣiṇāgni (i.e. one brought from a *vaiśya-kula* etc.) also, as with other impermanent objects (such as *ghaṭa*) and with permanent objects.

Now, the author of the Śl-Vt has been found to be a scholar different from Ptj and one who flourished after Kty[195]; further, Ptj can be said to be generally referring only to the main argument contained in the Śl-Vt.[196] — When this is accepted, we are not faced with a strange (unhistorical?) situation of finding the author of the Śl-Vt recording a higher degree of restriction in the semantic field, while Ptj, who came after him, reverting to a lower degree of restriction. For, by our interpretation, Ptj is taken to be having an identical usage with the one at the time of the author of the Śl-Vt, and only briefly referring to the condition stated in it, the Śl-Vt itself being immediately quoted in full by him without a dissenting note and by way of an authority.

The form *ānāyya-* is not attested in literature.

---

[194] That P does not want to use the form in respect of a fire is clear from the facts that fire is not understood in the three succeeding rules and that fire is expressely mentioned in the fourth next rule (3.1.131).

[195] See p. 232 from KIELHORN, "Some Suggestions Regarding the Verses (Kârikâs) in the Mahâbhâshya", *IA* (1886) 15.228-33: "My opinion then of the verses which have been explained in the Mahâbhâshya, is that they do not belong to Kâtyâyana at all, but have been borrowed or quoted by Patañjali from *other* works. There is every reason to believe that those works were composed after the *Vârttikas*."

[196] Loc. cit.: "Moreover,...Patañjali...frequently has taken the substance of his discussions and many of his arguments from those older works..."

Obsn 35 : P, Kty and Ptj, all, used the forms, *pāyya-* and *nikāyya-*, in particular senses.

P (3.1.129) lists *pāyya-* and *nikāyya-*, inter alia, as extraordinary forms (with *ṇyat*) in the restricted senses of " a measure " and "a dwelling " respectively. This implies that in other senses he used other forms which were regularly derived by his rules. Kty (3.1.129.1) explains that *pā-tva* and *ka-tva* were the special elements in these forms respectively. This helps Ptj to derive them from √*mā-* and *ni-* √*ci-* respectively and to give the counter-formations, *meya-* " to be measured " and *nicya-* "to be piled up" respectively, that could be regularly derived (with *yat*).[197]

The facts, that Kty explains the Sūtra (and suggests the derivation of the two forms) and that Ptj illustrates the Vt with counter-examples, suggest that the forms were a part of their usage also.

This, thus, reflects a continuous usage from P to Ptj.

In literature *nikāyya-*, as well as the uncompounded form *pāyya-* are not attested.[198]

Obsn 36 : (i) P used the form, *kuṇḍa-pāyyà-*.

(ii) Kty noted the form, perhaps as occurring in the Veda, to be *kuṇḍa- pā́yya-*. Probably it was used as such in his times.

(iii) Ptj's times showed its usage as noted by Kty.

In his Section dealing with forms showing the suffix *ṇyat* P (3.1.130 : *kratau kuṇḍapāyya- saṁcāyyau*) has listed the extraordinary form, *kuṇḍa-pāyya-*, in description of a (particular) sacrifice, such as " (the one) in[199] which (Soma) is to be drunk with a bowl. " Kty (3.1.130.1 : *kuṇḍapāyye yad-vidhiḥ*) adds that the form was to be supposed to have been derived with the suffix *yat*. This makes the form accented as *kuṇḍā-pāyya-* (by 6.1.213), instead of as *kuṇḍa-pāyyà* (by 6.1.185) when it showed the suffix *ṇyat* that was implicit in the rule of P. [200]

---

[197] See Obsn **12**.

[198] In *Suśruta* (1.60.17 : *ghṛtaṁ pāyyaḥ sa naraḥ*), recorded at *PW* 4.665, is only derived from the causal base.

[199] The location (*adhikaraṇa*) sense is brought out by *KV* (166) : *kuṇḍena pīyate 'sminn soma iti kuṇḍapāyyaḥ kratuḥ*.

[200] *ṇyat* would bring the *yug-āgma* easily by (*ñṇiti*) *āto yuk ciṇ-kṛtoḥ* (7.3.33); but *yat*, that brings the *ī* substitute for the final *ā* by (*āto*) *īd yati* (6.4.65), has first to disallow that substitute and get the *yug-āgama* by Nipātana.

Actually, the form, though of rare occurrence, is found to appear with the same accent as noted by Kty in *RV* (8 17.13), and in *TBr* (2.4.5.1) that quotes it, in the line, *yás te śṛṅgavrṣo napāt práṇayāt kuṇḍapā́yyaḥ*- Tradition in India understands the form in these contexts to be referring to a particular kind of (Soma) sacrifice,[201] and hence P may be supposed to have understood it likewise there (i.e. at its occurrence in *RV* and *TBr*). The *PW* (2.320) conjecture about *RV* occurrence to be standing ('probably' : German 'wohl') for a proper noun of certain men does not appear satisfactory.

Kty's note, therefore, seems to be intended to correct the accent in the form so as to bring it in consonance with the Vedic picture of this form of rare occurrence. So far so good.

But, as Kty's note seems to suggest, did P really forget this occurrence (— he could not obviously be unaware of it —) of the form that was actually referred to by him (in general) in its sacrificial context ? The context of the suffix *ṇyat* under which he has enumerated it and which would give it a different accent (the Antasvarita) would tend to suggest that he did forget. — But, we might be justified to pass on such a serious remark upon his observation (— 'serious '. because P was well aware of the sacrificial setting about the form that would brook not the slightest flaw in pronuciation —), if he had brought in to bear upon the form the sphere of the Vedic usage ('*chandasi*'). Actually, however, although forms connected with a sacrifice are recorded by him in this section of six Sūtra-s (3.1.327-132), he has in none of these rules restricted them to the Vedic usage. He could not have certainly repeated the error of forgetting to record this Vedic restriction **six times** at a stretch. Further, at least one such form recorded in these rules, *saṁcāyya-* "(a sacrifice) at which (Soma) is to be accumulated ", that is mentioned even beside *kuṇḍa-pāyya-* in the present rule, is not attested even in the Vedic literature that is extant. All this points to the fact that the sacrificial ceremonies (— and hence the sacrificial terms —) were as if a part and parcel of the general social atmosphere of the times in which P lived.

The conclusion, then, is irresistible that the forms peculiar to the sacrificial rites enjoyed currency side by side in the secular usage as well as in the ritual texts of the Veda; and it was most natural that in the secular usage the same form was uttered with a shift in the accent from the one shown in its Vedic or sacrificial usage.[202]

---

[201] Cp. Sāyaṇa (*RV* 8.17.13), *kuṇḍaiḥ pīyate 'smin soma iti kuṇḍa-pāyyaḥ kratuviśeṣaḥ*, and Bhaṭṭa-bhāskara-miśra (*TBr* 2.4.5.1, p. 182) *etannāmakaḥ somayāgaviśeṣaḥ*.

Basing our observation on this it may be concluded that P, enumerating the form in question under *ṇyat*, actually had it in his usage with the accent brought by *ṇyat*, viz. Anta-svarita, as *kuṇḍa-pāyyà-*. Kty was scrupulous to note the correct Vedic accent in it that differed from the one implied by P. Perhaps, as an orthodox Vedist and as a strict grammarian, he carried over the form with the very accent even in his secular usage; or the form was even current like that in his times: this can be viewed as a possibility, as Kty too has not restricted his note to the Vedic usage.[203]

As for Ptj, he illustrates the point of Kty (approvingly) with actual connected usage: *kuṇḍa-pā́yyaḥ kratuḥ* (II.89.16). This should suggest that he did use the form with the accent as noted by Kty.

The form is not attested in classical literature.[203a]

Obsn 37 : P, Kty and Ptj, all, had the form, *samūhya-*, in their usage.

P (3.1.131) records the form, *samūhya-*, used to refer to a kind of fire (lit. "to be carried together") as an extraordinary form showing the suffix *ṇyat*. Although Kty discusses its etymology (— whether from *sam* √*ūh-* or from *saṁ* √*vah-* —) and the propriety of its mention as a special form, neither he nor Ptj takes exception to its currency. Hence the form must be taken to be in the usage throughout.

The form is not attested in classical literature.

---

[202] This surmise is strengthened on Ptj's own well-known evidence in the *Paspaśāhnika*, where he cites the example of even certain great sages and masters of human conduct, (popularly) named Yarvāṇas-tarvāṇaḥ, who, discerningly would be strict in their utterances during sacrificial rites but would take liberty in the talk in practical life. See : *yad apy ucyata niyama iti, yājñe karmaṇi sa niyamaḥ. evaṁ hi śrūyate : yarvāṇas-tarvāṇo nāmarṣayo babhūvuḥ .... te tatrabhavanto 'yad vā nas tad vā na 'iti prayoktavye 'yar vā ṇas tar vā ṇa 'iti prayuñjate; yājñe punaḥ karmaṇi nāpabhāṣante.* (I.11.10-14) Compare also Mahopādhyāya Vardhamāna quoted in *SDS* (*P-Darśana*), p. 291 :

laukika-vyavahāreṣu yatheṣṭaṁ caṣṭatāṁ janaḥ /
vaidikeṣu tu mārgeṣu viśeṣoktiḥ pravartatām //

Attention can also be drawn to the reference made by S. Venkitasubramonia IYER to "Vedic forms in Bhāṣā" and to "Vedic Sūtras applied to Bhāṣā" : vide pp. 65 f. and 113-19 respectively of his *Nārāyaṇabhaṭṭa's Prakriyāsarvasva : A Critical Study*, Kerala University Sanskrit Department Publication No. 7, Trivandrum, 1972.

[203] See Obsn 7, fn. 142.

[203a] The form *kuṇḍa-* can be seen recorded by BURROW (op. cit., pp. 381, 386) in his list of "the most important and certain of the Dravidian loans."

Obsn 38 : (i) P used the feminine noun, *agni-cityā̀*, probably in the action sense.

(ii) Kty noted perhaps the Vedic occurrence of the form as *agni-cityā́-* in the action sense. Probably the usage of his times contained it as such.

(iii) Ptj's usage probably showed it as noted by Kty.

In the sacrificical setting found at 3.1.127-132, P (3.1.132 : *cityāgnicitye ca*) has recorded a form *agni-cityā-*[204] " arrangement of the (sacrificial) fire ", among those occurring in the context of the (sacrificial) fire ('*agnau*' 3.1.131). On the first look the form seems to be showing the suffix *kyap*.[205] But as the whole section of these six rules shows itself to be under the sphere of *ṇyat*, this form also, that is recorded in the last one of the six rules, is to be taken as showing the suffix *ṇyat*[206] according to P. The special purpose of this must be to denote the accent, viz. Anta-svarita, brought by the suffix *ṇyat*[207] (by 6.1.185). Thus, the form appears to have been accented as *agni-cityā̀-* in the time of P.

Now, as in *kuṇḍa-pāyya-* (Obsn **36**), here too, the form is found to occur with a different accent in the Vedic literature, as *agni-cityā́* (cp. *ŚBr* 6.6.1.1, 13 etc.). — Kty is quick to note the form with this very accent in it[208] as well as the action sense in it (3.1.132.1 : *agnicityā bhāve 'ntodāttaḥ*).

Here again it has to be pointed out that P did not mean to refer to the form in its Vedic usage, as there is no qualifying word, *chandasi*, seen in the Sūtra. Hence it can be supposed that the form as used in P's time had developed a shift in the accent from the one as used in the same form in the Veda or in the sacrificial rites. The form was used not only in the Vedic or sacrificial texts but in the secular usage of his time as well. The action sense that it denoted was probably so obvious and common in the usage that this familiarity with it made P presume it, and the need to state it expressly escaped him; in other words, he forgot to note it.

Kty need not be taken to be referring to the correct accent that the form showed in its **Vedic** occurrence. As he too has not restricted his note to the Vedic usage, he might be taken to be referring to the form as it occurred in his own contemporary usage.

---

[204] P's rule could as well be understood to be recording the **neuter** forms, *citya-* and *agni-citya-*.

[205] Bringing in the *tug-āgama* by 6.1.71.

[206] With the *tug-āgama* and *vṛddhy-abhāva* by Nipātana.

[207] The suffix *kyap*, by 6.2.139 and 3.1.4, would have shown the accent as *agni-cítya-*.

[208] This has led *KV* (166) to see in the form the suffix '*ya*' (or *ya-śabda*, set up once while deriving the form *deva-yajyā-* by a Kārikā-kāra quoted in *M* on 3.1.123, II.87.22, 88.2); the *tug-āgma* and *guṇa=abhāva* would be by Nipātana, and the accent by 6.2.139 and 3.1.3.

Ptj's approving explanation of Kty's note, in the words : ***agni–cayanam eva=agni-cityā*** (*II.90.12*), points to the currency of the form in his usage in the manner of Kty.

The form is not attested in classical literature.

Addenda to <<5>>

(Formations by the Sūtra 3.1.124.)

Obsn 39 : P, Kty and Ptj, all, used the form ***ghātya–*** derived from √*han–*.

Kty probably saw in his usage the forms, ***ghātya–*** as well as ***vadhya–*** "to be killed", both derived from √*han–*. He derived ***vadhya–*** (3.1.97.2) irregularly from √*han–*, optionally substituted by ***vadha–***, and the suffix *yat* (that is laid down by P for vowel–ending roots). The implication of the option is that, when √*han–* is not substituted by ***vadha–***, it produces the form ***ghātya–*** regularly from the rules of P with *ṇyat* etc. (3.1.124, 7.2.116, 7.3.32 and 7.3.54). So Ptj makes a reference to this form also in his gloss (II. 82.16).

Thus, there appears to be a continuity of its usage from P to Ptj.

In literature, ***ghātya–*** is found first recorded (as ***sukha–ghātya–***) only in the *Pañcatantra* (3.14. 2/3).

Obsn 40 : (i) Ptj used the compound form *śva–ghātya–* in the object sense.

(ii) Of its currency in the usage of P and Kty we have no definite knowledge.

Ptj has noted a usage of his time, *śvaghātyo vṛṣalaḥ* (II.84.8), containing the compond form *śva–ghātya–* "fit to be killed by a dog ". Beyond this one mention we have no evidedce on the history of the compound form, in spite of the fact that *śvan–* is known to the Veda, *Nir* (3.18), *USā* (1.158), to P and to Kty, and that ***ghātya–*** is just now seen to have been current throughout the period.

The form is not attested in literature.

Obsn 41 : P, Kty and Ptj had the form *ācārya–* quite common in their usage.

As a counter–illustration (' *a-gurau* ') to *ācarya–* derived by Kty (3.1. 100.1) from *ā–* √*car–* with *yat* (— see Obsn 6—), Ptj gives, what was probably intended by Kty, *ācārya–* " a preceptor ', derived from the same root with *ṇyat* by the rule of P (3.1.124) for consonant–ending roots;[209] he also gives by way of a connected usage: *ācārya upanayamānaḥ* which is found to be a partial quotation from the *AV* line: *ācāryá upanáyamāno brahmacāríṇaṁ kṛṇute gárbham antáḥ* (11.5.3 according to the Śaunaka version, but 11.7.3 in the edition by S. P. PANDIT; and 16,153.2 according to the Paippalāda version).

---

[209] RENOU in the *Grammaire sanscrite* (p. 203 : 156.c.3) has pointed out the agent sense present in *ācārya-* as against the verbal (— it should be : objective —) sense in *ācarya-*. In that case, *ācārya-* would have to be derived only by the Bāhulaka-rule (3.3.113).

The form is found frequently referred to in the rules of P and in the comments of Kty and Ptj. Also, Yāska has suggested a derivation for it: *ācārya ācāraṁ grāhayati* (*Nir* 1.4). This might bear a distant echo with Kty in *ācāryācārāt saṁjñāsiddhiḥ, yathā laukika-vaidikeṣu* (1.1.1.4). From Ptj's explanation of the Vt (I.38.11–18), the word *ācārya-* seems to possess a two-fold significance with him: (1) " an elderly relation like a parent", (2) " a preceptor (being a Vedic scholar)."

Obsn 42: (i) P might have used forms like *pravādya-* and *apavādya-*.
(ii) Kty probably used such forms.
(iii) Ptj certainly used them.

When P (3.1.106: *vadaḥ supi kyap ca*) lays down the suffixes *kyap* and *yat* after √*vad*-preceded by a Subanta Upapada, Kty (3.1.106.1: *vadaḥ supy 'anupasarga'-grahaṇam*) suggests a qualification in the rule, in order to eliminate Upasarga-s from Subanta-s; for he probably used forms like *pravādya-* ' to be tuned or played upon" and *apavādya-* " to be censured" (given by Ptj to explain Kty) where only *ṇyat* was seen after √*vad-* preceded by Upasarga-s.

Ptj's answer is that it was not necessary to add such a qualification to P's rule, as it was already there, being drawn from the earlier rule, *gada-mada-cara-yamaś cānupasarge* (3.1.100); nor was it necessary to be told that the earlier '*anupasarge*' was to be understood in the present rule, for that was self-evident for an Adhikāra.[210]

This suggests that forms with the Vṛddhi due to *ṇyat* after √*vad-* preceded by an Upasarga were a common phenomenon not only with Kty and Ptj but perhaps with P as well.

The forms are not attested in literature.

Obsn 43: (i) P knew the form *vārya-* and probably derived it from √*vṛ*(*ṅ*)-.
(ii) Kty and Ptj knew it and derived it likewise,

To the form *vṛtya-* (— see Obsn **18** —) derived by P (3.1.109) with *kyap* from √*vṛ-* (which was understood as *vṛñ* by Kty, 3.1.109.1), the form *vārya-* was supplied as a counter-illustration by Ptj (as being so intended by Kty), and even the connected usage containing it was mentioned by him (following '*iha mā bhūt*') as *vāryā ṛtvijaḥ* (II.84.20).

---

[210] See fn. 164.

By elimination it was the different √*vṛ*–, viz. *vṛṅ* (as probably first noted in *KV* 162), that is supposed to give this *vārya*–.[211] Now, *vṛṅ* is noted in *DhP* (1510) and by NBh (145a) to be in the sense of '*saṁbhakti*' "complete sharing; honouring, presenting with a gift". So *vārya*– in Ptj's quotation has to be understood as "to be co–opted; to be presented with a gift," if not "to be chosen".[212] However, its occurrence in *BD* (4.73B), *niruktaṁ tad idaṁ vāryam,* is taken as a noun and translated as "choice" by MACDONELL.[213] Further, *TattvaB* on another Sūtra explains *vārya*– from Ptj's line clearly as "to be chosen".[214]

The usage recorded by Ptj sounds like a Vedic quotation. In that case that must have been known to P. Further, *vārya*– is given the accent as *vā́rya*– by P by means of his rule. *īḍa-vanda-vṛ-śaṁsu-duhāṁ ṇyataḥ* (6.1.214), and is so found in *RV* (8.35.12), *Nigh* (4.2) and *Nir* (5.1), though not attested in later literature in that sense.

Thus, the form seems to be in continuous usage from P to Ptj, though we cannot be certain about that.

Obsn 44 : (i) It is possible though not certain that P used the masc. common noun, *bhārya*–. He had before him the Vedic common noun, *bhārya*–, meaning "a dependent",

(ii) Kty and Ptj both used the masc. noun form in the sense of 'a Kṣatriya '.

A Kṛtya form from √*bhṛ*–, a ṛ–ending root, could normally be derived from P's rule, *ṛ-halor ṇyat* (3.1.124). However, according to him, "when not a name (or a proper noun)[215]" such a form (*bhṛtya*– "to be supported") was to show the suffix *kyap* after √*bhṛ*– (*bhṛño ' saṁjñāyām,* 3.1.112). While discussing the propriety of the qualifying word '*a-saṁjñāyām*' in this rule, a prima facie view is first recorded by Kty in Vt 1 that even in Saṁjñā–words *kyap* after √*bhṛ*– was found enjoined by P in the rule, '*saṁjñāyāṁ samaja-niṣada-*

---

[211] See fn. 158 on Obsn **18**.

[212] See fn. 159 on Obsn **18**.

[213] Part II, p. 145.

[214] P. 482, on *SK* 2849 (3.1.101) :—*varyā=iti striyām eva nipātyate. astriyāṁ tu vṛṅaḥ ṛhalor ṇyat : vāryā ṛtvijaḥ. ṛtvijām api yajñamātre varaṇīyatvād anirodho 'sti strītvaṁ tu nāsti=iti ṇyad eva bhavati. etac ca vṛttikāra-matam. na cātra 'eti-stu°' iti kyap śaṅkyaḥ. tatra vṛña eva grahaṇaṁ na tu vṛṅa iti siddhāntāt.*

[215] The exact significance of the term '*saṁjñā*' in P, whether a common noun or a proper noun, has not yet been decided to be uniformly applicable in his sūtra-s. In general, it stands for a *yoga-rūḍha* term i.e. one "whose etymological meaning is restricted by convention," according to G. B. PALSULE, "Saṁjñāyām in Pāṇini," *JUP* (1966) 25.68f.

nipata-mana-vida-ṣuñ-śīṅ-bhṛñ-iṇaḥ (3.3.99), and that this prohibition (Pratiṣedha) '*a-saṁjñāyām*' was thus made meaningless[216] by P himself. The objection is met by Kty in Vt 2, saying that although Saṁjñā-words were derived by P (3.3.99) with *kyap* after *√bhṛ-*, those were only the feminine ones as his rule (3.3.99) occurred under the *Stry-adhikāra.* Thus, the objection was only partly correct and *kyap* after *√bhṛ-* continued to be forbidden by P's rule in the case of masculine Saṁjñā-words. This makes the qualification '*a-saṁjñāyām*' in 3.1.112 definitely valid in the case of masculine Saṁjñā-words which, therefore, can show *ṇyat* by P's rule, *ṛ-halor ṇyat,* deriving the form *bhārya-* " a Kṣatriya ", as in the usage, *bhāryā nāma kṣatriyāḥ* (II.85.19-20), supplied by Ptj in illustration of Vt 2.

Thus, while justifying P's use of the term, '*a-saṁjñāyām*', though only partly, Kty implies the form, *bhārya-*, and Ptj, approvingly, further supplies us with its meaning. No usage of the form, however, is found recorded in the Vedic literature or in the classical Sanskrit literature. It cannot be said definitely whether it did or did not exist even in the usage of P.

Incidentally, it may be noted that the word *bhārya-* occurs also in *TS*, *AiBr*, *ŚBr* and *BĀrUp*[217] but not as a Saṁjñā-word : it means there " a dependent ", and appears to be formed irregularly[218] as not being a Saṁjñā, the form ought not to show *ṇyat* but only *kyap* by the rule *bhṛño 'saṁjñāyām* (3 1.112). But as P might have known it we may suppose here a semantic transition from *bhārya-* " a dependent ", as attested before P, to *bhārya-* " a Kṣatriya ", as attested at the time of Ptj, through some degree of noun-force current in the form at the times of P and Kty.[219]

The form is not attested in Classical Sanskrit.

Obsn 45 : P, Kty, 'Apara' and Ptj, all, used the noun, *bhāryā-*.

A Kṛtya-form (*bhṛtyā-*) from *√bhṛ-*, when a name and bearing the feminine gender, was derived with the suffix *kyap* by P by the rule, *saṁjñāyāṁ samaja°......* (3.3.99).

But the Kṛtya form *bhāryā-* " a wife ", also being a Saṁjñā-word derived from *√bhṛ-* and feminine in gender, shows the suffix *ṇyat* in it. As a result, the form *bhāryā-* known to the Vedic as well as the secular usages, should apparently be considered underived by the rules of P.

---

[216] *anarthakaḥ pratiṣedho 'pratiṣedhaḥ, M* II.85.14.

[217] *BĀrUp* 1.3.18 : *atha ya evaitam (=prāṇam) anubhavati yo vai tam anu bhāryān bubhūrṣati sa haivālaṁ bhāryebhyo bhavati.*

[218] Somewhat after the manner of (*saṁbhṛtya-* and) *saṁbhārya-* noted by Kty (3.1.112.4 : *samaś ca bahulam*) : see Obsn **21.**

[219] Can that be why even Kty is silent on the derivation of this Vedic *bhārya-*, when he could have added a note like '*bhṛñaś ca bahulaṁ chandasi*' ? I.e. does he imply by 3.1.112.2 derivation of this *bhārya-* also ?

So Kty, 'Apara' and Ptj, all, make a great effort at interpreting the rule of P (3.3.99) for it to yield the formation of *bhāryā-*, by offering a number of alternative suggestions.[220] This fact shows how well established the form was throughout in their usage.

Obsn 21 : (This may be referred to here for the use of *saṁbhārya-*.)

Obsn 46 : P, Kty and Ptj, all, used the form, *gopya-*.

The form, *gopya-* "to be protected", is understood by Ptj as a counter-illustration (*gopyam anyat* II.86.22) to *kupya-* that was specified by Kty to be used only as a name (3.1.114.2 : *kupyaṁ saṁjñāyām*), both being derived from √*gup-* by Ptj. The form *gopya-* can be derived from √*gup-* with the addition of *ṇyat* by P's rule, *ṛ-halor ṇyat*, meant in general for consonant-ending roots; and the root √*gup-* is also used by P in his rules. Hence, P (and Kty too) may be taken to be using *gopya-* derived from √*gup-*.

The form, thus, shows a continuous usage.

Its earliest literary occurrence appears to be in *MBhr* (12.41.14) :

sahadevaṁ samīpasthaṁ nityam eva samādiśat /
tena gopyo hi nṛpatiḥ sarvāvastho viśāṁ pate //

Obsn 47 : (i) P probably did not use the form, *kṛṣṭa·pākya-*.

(ii) Kty perhaps used it.

(iii) Ptj certainly used it.

---

[220] (1) Thus, Kty, first of all, wants to add the phrase *'na striyāṁ bhṛñaḥ'* after 3.3.99. (By this, the injunctive rule or *vidhi*, 3.3.99, governed by *'striyām'*, would be supposed to derive *bhṛtyā-* with *kyap;* and Kty's prohibitive rule or Pratiṣedha after that, containing a different *'strī'* in the sense of an ordinary woman, would be deriving *bhāryā-* with *ṇyat.* See Kaiy, 146b.) — This suggestion though yielding the desired forms, is rejected by Ptj on the ground that it involves a severe tampering with the Sūtra. (*sidhyati. sūtraṁ tarhi bhidyate. yathā·nyāsam evāstu.* — II. 85.23-86.1.)

(2) 'Apara' points out that in the case of a root like √*bhṛ-* from the rule 3.3.99, there is to be seen the **action**-sense (cp. *bhāvavyāpāro vācyatvena vivakṣito, na tu śāstrīyo 'dhikāraḥ, KV* 214) : hence we get an action-noun *bhṛtyā-* "service" with *kyap.* But *bhāryā-* "wife" having reference to the **object** ("what is supported") would not fall under that rule, but show *ṇyat.* — This is one of the two suggestions favoured by Ptj.

(3) 'Apara' alternatively seeks to escape from the difficulty on the strength of the irregularity observed by P in the Kṛtya-formations (*kṛtya-lyuṭo bahulam,* 3.3.113). See fn. 126 for the quotation.

(4) The second suggestion of Ptj, which is purely his own, is to understand the word *'Saṁjñā'*, in the suffixes enjoined to produce the *saṁjñā*-forms, as "a name formed with the addition of a suffix" (*pratyayāntena cet saṁjñā gamyate,* II.86.4); this would derive *bhṛtyā-* with *kyap* by 3.3.99. This interpretation of *'saṁjñā'* would exclude *bhāryā-* from the sphere of that rule and conversely make it show *ṇyat,* as *bhāryā-* is a 'Saṁjñā' in the sense of "an idea to be expressed" (*saṁjñāyām abhidheyāyām,* II.86.3).

To the form, *kṛṣṭa-pacya-*, that was observed by Kty (3.1.114.3) to be possessing the reflexive force and the final accent (-see Obsn 25 –), Ptj supplies as a counter-illustration the form, *kṛṣṭa-pākya-* "growing or ripening (with effort) in cultivated ground" (with the *kutva* by 7.3.52). This latter form was seen by Ptj[221] as not possessing the two·peculiarities[222] noted by Kty: as:being present in the former one.

The form, *kṛṣṭa-pākya-*, is derived with *ṇyat* attached to √*pac-* having *kṛṣṭa-* as the Upapada.

Ptj's mention (and explanation) of it as showing contrast with *kṛṣṭa-pacya-* (in the reflexive force) points to its currency in his usage. But we cannot state the same definitely about the usage of Kty. His note may or may not imply existence in his usage of the the converse form, *kṛṣṭa-pākya-*. P gives no indication that it existed in the usage of his time.

The form is not attested in literture.

Obsn 26: (This may be referred to here for the use of *pratigrāhya-* and *apigrāhya-*.)

Obsn 48 : (i) P used the form *amāvasyā-* as well as *amā-vāsyā-*.

(ii) Did some scholars near to the K(ārikā)-kāra use *amā-vásyā-* ?

(iii) The K-kāra and Ptj used the forms, *amā-vasyā̀-* and *amā-vāsyā̀-*.

P (3.1.122) has laid down, " Optionally (the form) *amāvasya-* is (declared as grammatically correct) with the Ta-kāra (as Anubandha); " *amāvasyā-* means " (that time) in which (the sun and the moon) dwell together[223] (i.e. the night of the new moon). " The context is the ending part of his rules enjoining the suffix *kyap*; but *kyap* is not to be supposed here on account of the Takāra-anubandha.[224] The suffix *yat* (though obtaining from the larger context[225]) is also to be excluded, says Ptj and, by implication, also the K-kāra quoted by him; for, *yat* would be deriving the form accented as *amāvásyā-* (by 6.1.213). The form wanted by the K-kāra and Ptj was *amāvasyā̀-*;[226] and this can be had (by 6.1.185) by an optional extraordinary mention of Vṛddhy-abhāva in the form (*amāvāsya-*) derived with *ṇyat*. Alternatively, the form *amāvāsyà-* (with Vṛddhi) can also be directly derived with *ṇyat*.[227]

---

[221] Explained by him as : *yo hi kṛṣṭe paktavyaḥ kṛṣṭa-pākyaḥ sa bhavati* (II. 86.25).

[222] Cp. *PdM* (511) : *śuddhe tu karmaṇi.*

[223] See *KV* (164), *saha vasato 'smin kāle sūryā-candramasāv iti,* and *ŚabK* (II.414), *nipātanād eva kāla-viśeṣe rūḍhir labhyate.*

[224] Cp. *Ny* and especially *PdM* (514) as : *takāroccāraṇāt prakṛtasya kyapas tāvan nipātanaṁ na bhavati.*

[225] *'parama-prakṛta'*, *PdM*, 514.

[226] See Ptj : *amāvásyā evaṁ svaraḥ prasajyeta; amāvasyā̀ iti ca=iṣyate* (II.87. 6-7).

Such is the traditional interpretation of the rule, as handed down from the time of the K-kāra.[228] Nothing definitely, however, can be said about the usages intended by P and Kty. P has used *amāvasya-* optionally in the present rule and *amāvāsyā-* (fem.) in the rule, *amāvāsyāyā vā* (4.3.30).[229] But we do not know for certain the accent intended by him on *amāvasya-*.

Even with that, it has been rightly pointed out by Jinendrabuddhi[230] that the use of the first person made in the quoted Kārikā (viz. *amāvasor 'ahaṁ' ṇyator 'nipātayāmy' ......svaraś ca 'me' prasidhyati*) suggests that there were other schools of thought (probably contemporaneous with the K-kāra) that did not agree with him. They probably saw in it the suffix *yat* and the consequent accent in the form as *amāvásyā-*. If this surmise were true, then it can be said that there was at least one stage in the usage, showing the form as *amāvásyā-*. This stage must be current either closely in chronology, or closely in region, or both, with that of the K-kāra. The other stage in the accentuation of the form was the one represented by the K-kāra and Ptj who pronounced the form as *amāvasyā̀-*. Want of evidence, however, handicaps a definite statement on the point although the surmise holds some ground.

As for Ptj, he records from his usage *amāvasysā̀-* (at II.87.7) and *amāvāsyā-* (at II.386.9 on 5.3.59.4 : (*adhyeyaṁ*) *na=amāvāsyāyāṁ, na caturdaśyām iti*).

Obsn 49 : (i) P and Kty probably found the Vedic *upacāyya-pṛḍa-* to mean "pleasing the *Upacāyya-* fire".

(ii) Ptj found it used only in the sense of "gold", and he used *upaceya-pṛḍa-* to express other ideas.

---

[227] The form either way is only an Upapada-compound which alone, by *gatikārakapapadāt kṛt* (6.2.139), retains on the second member of the compound the original accent had by the accent-rules (6.1.213 or 6.1.185). Otherwise, the general accent-rule, *samāsasya* (6.1.223), would make the form accented on the final syllable. So, *amā-* is to be supposed to be an Upapada, either extraordinarily or as one the locative case after which is elided. See *PdM* (514) : *upapadatvam api nipātanād eva, amā=iti vā saptamyā lukā nirdeśaḥ.*

[228] See M. D. BALASUBRAHMANYAM, "Amāvasyā : an Accentual Study", *JUP* (1968) 27.1-25.

[229] The further use of having these two forms, as declared by the K-kāra (viz. *tathaikavṛttitā tayoḥ ... me prasidhyati*) and Ptj, is to get the two sets of Taddhita forms from the rule 4.3.30, by the maxim, *ekadeśa-vikṛtasya=ananyatvāt* (from Vt 2 on *ŚSū* 2 etc.), thus :
from the 'Prakṛti' viz *amāvāsyā-*: with *vun* — *amāvāsyaka-*,
with *aṇ* — *āmāvāsya-;*
from the 'Vikṛti' viz. *amāvasya-* : with *vun* — *amāvasyaka-*,
with *aṇ* — *āmāvasya-*.

[230] Ny (515) : *'aham' ity ātmānaṁ vyapadeśayann 'apare 'nyathā kurvant'=iti sūcayati.*

In a Sūtra (3.1.111), enumerating some extraordinary formations peculiar to the Veda, P lists a form *upacāyya-pṛḍa-*. The Kārikā quoted by Ptj explains the irregular features of it to be *ṇyat* and *āy-ādeśa*. (*ṇyad āyādeśa ity etāv upacāyye* [i.e. *upacāyya-pṛḍe*] *nipātitau*, II.87.18). The sense of the form[231] is specified only by Ptj as "gold" (***hiraṇya iti ca vaktavyam***, II.88.4); while to express an idea "other than gold" (***anyatra***, l.c.)[232] the form *upaceya-pṛḍa-* is given by him. *upacāyya-pṛḍa-* is traced to *KāṭhS* (11.1), *upacāyya-pṛḍaṁ hiraṇyaṁ dakṣiṇā* (p.97).

Now, there is another Sūtra, *agnau paricāyya=upacāyya-samūhyāḥ* (3.1.131), that is not restricted by P to the Vedic or to the secular language, and hence which can be taken as common to both. There P enumerates, inter alia, *upacāyya-* (from *upa-√ci-*) as an extraordinary form (with *ṇyat* and *āy-ādeśa*) restricted in the sense[233] of "a fire". This should suggest that he used another form, *upaceya-* (with *yat* regularly by 3.1.97), which did not carry the sense of a fire but just the literal sense viz. "to be collected or heaped up."; this form, however, is not found attested in the Veda or in later literature.

But the case is different with P's *upacāyya-pṛḍa-*, given by him as an irregular form (but not restricted in any meaning). This does not necessarily mean that P also knew the strange form, *upaceya-pṛḍa-* (also foreign to the Veda in its extant form). Although the component *upaceya-* within it was regularly derived with *yat*, the compound extension *upaceya-pṛḍa-* cannot be inferred from it as a corollary to *upacāyya-pṛḍa-*; for, as was the irregular form *upacāyya-*, the irregular form *upacāyya-pṛḍa-* was **not** restricted to any sense by P, and no semantic distribution in the compounds was possible hère (as in *upacāyya-*: *upaceya-*) in the absence of record of such a semantic development at his time. Further, *upaceya-pṛḍa-* cannot be inferred as a normal form existing in the **secular** usage of P, in contrast with the irregular form *upacāyya-pṛḍa-* restricted by him to the **Vedic**. For, unlike *upacāyya-*, *upaceya-* cannot be treated as a substantive; and again, even for the appositional compounding of the participles, *upaceya-* and

---

[231] THIEME (*P&V*, 21) translates *'hiraṇye'* of Ptj as "before (the word) *hiraṇya-*". This does not seem to be correct. Ptj is not generally found to be denoting by the locative an Upapada, and that too in its *anvartha* nature as *upoccāri* ("adjacent") *padam*. Further, this goes against the explicit statements of *PdM* (*hiraṇye 'bhidheya ity arthaḥ*, p. 517) and *TattvaB* (on *SK* 3407, *hiraṇye 'bhidheye ity arthaḥ*, p. 590). — Or, perhaps THIEME understands Ptj's *'hiraṇye'* as a case of *para-saptamī*. But all similar instances from Ptj's Vt-s require to be examined for that.

[232] THIEME (l.c.) : "before another word" (i.e. one other than *hiraṇya-*).

[233] *KV* (166) : *agnāv abhidheye.*

pṛḍa-, there is no evidence in the literature preceding P.[234] In all likelihood, therefore, P found only one form, *upacāyya-pṛḍa-*, and that as conveying the general or literal sense of " pleasing[235] the *upacāyya-* fire ",[236] in the **context** of gold in the Vedic passage noted above. — The situation was probably the same even with Kty as he is completely silent on this and has no modificatory note to append (which comes later only from Ptj).

Side by side, however, there must be undergoing slow changes in the sacrificial practices as well as in the material condition of the society. By the time of Ptj, the sacerdotal tradition and standards probably reached such a stage that nothing else was accepted as " pleasing the *upacāyya-* fire " than gold : hence the term *upacāyya-pṛḍa-* itself was then made a substantive in the restricted **sense** of " gold " and was accepted as such in the current usage though chiefly during the performance of sacrificial rites. — To express an idea of " what is to be collected and is pleasing ", probably a new term, *upaceya-pṛḍa-*, was coined at the time. Ptj's '*anyatra*' probably shows the contrast between the two forms, the second form (*upaceya-pṛḍa-*) being found in the secular usage.

This observation may be taken as gaining a slight corroboration from the absence of *upacāyya-pṛḍa-* among the Vedic synonyms for gold in *Nigh* (1.2 = *Nir* 2.11).

---

[234] THIEME (*P&V*, 21), however, sees it differently : "It further follows that he (i.e. Ptj) knew some Vedic passage with *upaceyapṛḍam*". But, chiefly absence of *upaceya-* in the Veda goes against his surmise.

[235] Cp. *PdM* (517) : *mṛḍa sukhe* (*DhP* 1328, .. *sukhane*) *pṛḍa ca* (1329) *ety etasmāt igupalhalakṣaṇaḥ kaḥ*. *PW* (5.878) and WHITNEY ["The Veda in Pāṇini", *GSAI* (1893) 7.249f., which has been quoted by v. SCHROEDER (p. 163) in his essay, "Das Kāṭhaka", *ZDMG* (1895) 49.145-171] suppose, in the compound, *mṛḍa-* as the final member instead of *pṛḍa-*. The Vedic forms ending in *pṛḍa-* are found by v. SCHROEDER (i.c. 164) and P. THIEME (*P&V*, 21) to be *aṣṭāpṛḍa-* and *hiraṇya-pṛḍa-* besides *upacā°*. On the last form WHITNEY's remark is : "perhaps a blunder for *upacāyamṛḍa* Kāṭh." (Is that a printing mistake for °*yyam*° ?)

[236] As against this : *upacāyyaṁ ca tat pṛḍaṁ ca=iti karmadhārayaḥ* (*PdM* 517, *TattvaB* 590).

A-2. EXTRA-ORDINARY CASES OF KṚTYA FORMS

Obsn 50 : P, Kty and Ptj, all, used the form, *geya-*, in the objective as well as the agent senses.

By the end of the Kṛt Section, P has mentioned a form, *geya-*, in the Sūtra, *bhavya-geya-*° ‘*vā*’ (3.4.68), which enumerates a few extraordinary cases of Kṛtya forms. As a general rule, the Kṛtya-s are enjoined by him to carry the objective or the impersonal sense (by *tayor eva kṛtya-kta-khalarthāḥ*, 3.4.70). But, like the rest of the Kṛt-s (*kartari kṛt*, 3.4.68), the few cases (including *geya-*) enumerated at 3.4.68 also carry the agent sense; this is by way of an option (‘*vā*’) to their regular objective or impersonal sense (3.4.70). Thus, *geya-* (derived from √*gai-* “to sing” with *yat* by 3.1.97[237]) shows both the objective sense, viz. “to be sung”, as well as the agent sense, viz. “who sings”.

Ptj's usage retains in *geya-* both these forces in a striking manner. For, of all the forms enumerated by P at 3.4.68, only *bhavya-* (once, I. 483.6) and *geya-* are found recorded in his Commentary, indendpently of Kty.[238] The use of *geya-* is illustrated by him at two places, once on 2.3.71 (I.470 f.) and again on 3.4.67 (II.178 f.), in the two connected usages (showing respectively the objective sense and the agent sense): *geyāni māṇavakena sāmāni* and *geyo maṇavakaḥ sāmnām.*

By *kṛtyānāṁ kartari vā* (2.3.71), where these are recorded, a third usage, **geyāni māṇavakasya sāmāni*, showing an optional use of the genitive case after the subject *māṇavaka-*, was possible : why Ptj has not given that at either of the two places is not quite clear. Perhaps it was owing to the absence of such a usage (Anabhidhāna) in his time — ?

Anyhow, *geya-* in its two forces shows definite contiunity in the usage from P to Ptj.

geya- in the agent sense is not attested in literature.

---

[237] *KV* (160) on the Sūtra.

[238] Ptj is once again found to mention *bhavya-* (III. 167.22), but that is in explanation of Kty's earlier mention of it (6.3.70.3).

Obsn 51 : (i) P, and perhaps Kty also, did not use the form, *a-punargeya-*.
(ii) Ptj used it.

At three places Ptj has used the form, *a-punar-geya-* "not (fit) to be recited or sung again", as a part of the usage, *apunargeyāḥ ślokāḥ* (I. 101.15. on 1.1.43, I.361.21 on 2.1.1, II. 109.19 on 3.2.80). As the negative particle '*a*' in the compound is not syntactically connected (*anvita* or *samartha*) with '*punar-*' but with '*geya-*'[239], this is a case of prohibition of a possible activity (*Prasajya-pratiṣedha*), not of exclusion of a matter (*Paryudāsa*)[240]. This is, therefore, a compound that is not syntactically well connected (*Asamartha-samāsa*), and so an incorrect expression, as the foremost condition of comopounding is proper syntactical relation between the components (*samarthaḥ pada-vidhiḥ*, 2.1.1). Otherwise, a new injunction (*Apūrva vidhi*) will have to be made that ". this incoherent compound should be declared (as correct usage)". (*sa tarhy asamartha-samāso vaktavyaḥ*, II. 109. 17f., or cp. …… *draṣṭavyaḥ*, I. 101. 14.)

Ptj's answer to this was that even though such a statement were made it was justified to do so; for, there were found (not sporadically just one or two but) many such cases[241] in the usage that made sense to the people; and those demanded sanction. (*yady api vaktavyo, ' thavā = etarhi 'bahūni ' prayojanāni*, I.101,.14f., II.109.18.) It could not, therefore, be the purpose of the word ' '*samartha*' in the rule 2.1.1 to deny sanction[242] to every kind of incoherent compound.

At another place, however, he says, sanction should no doubt be granted to some usage of the type that is even represented in a rule of P (viz. *suḍ anapuṁsakasya*, 1.1.43) by the expression '*a-napuṁsaka-*[243]' (which, therefore, serves as a *Jñāpaka* for such sanction.[244] (— This, however, appears to be a far-fetched inference of P's intention : even Kty cannot be taken to be implying agreement with such a usage, as he is totally silent on it. —)

---

[239] Cp. Kaiy (II.321a) : *'punar na geyā 'iti gānena nañaḥ saṁbandho, na tu punaḥ-śabdārthena.*

[240] Cp. *'prasajya-pratiṣedhaḥ' syāt kriyayā saha yatra nañ/*
'paryudāsaḥ' sa vijñeyo yatrottarapadena nañ//
For probably the earliest clear definition of the two terms, refer to the verses in *SāhD* on 7.4 (pp. 386, 388). See also the *Vākyapadīya* (2.44, 84; 3.14.292). See also George CARDONA, "Negations in Pāṇinian Rules", *Lg* (1967) 43.34-56. *Sūtras of Bharadvāja*

[241] For instances from the Sūtra literature, see C. G. KASHIKAR, record of similar cases
(1964) : Introduction, p. lxiv and fn. 2 there quoting a from the *Jātaka* and *ĀpŚS*.
made by BÜHLER (*ZDMG* 40.540)

[242] *asty asamartha-samāso nañ-samāso gamakas, tasya sādhutvaṁ mā bhūt*, I.361.18f.

[243] *na hi 'naño' 'napuṁsakena' sāmarthyam. kena tarhi? 'bhavatinā' : 'na bhavati napuṁsakasya'=iti.* I.101.5f.

[244] Cp. the statements of the later scholiasts : Kaiy (I.370a) : *tatra, 'strī-puṁsayor'*
iti (*mātrādhikye 'pi spaṣṭapratipatty-artham*, NBh l.c.) *vaktavye, 'anapuṁsa-*
kasya'=iti vacanaṁ jñāpakaṁ : 'prasajyapratisedhe 'pi nañ-samāso' sti=' iti.
BhD (*ŚabK* I.184 : .... *gauravaṁ ca prāmāṇikam. etena hi 'kecin nañ-samāsā*
asāmarthye'pi sādhava' iti jñāpyate.

But, Ptj declares, such a sanction should be granted in a limited number of cases. (*avaśyaṁ* ' *kasyacin* ' *nañ-samāsasya* = *asamarthasya gamakasya*[245] *sādhutvaṁ vaktavyam*.........*etan niyamārthaṁ bhaviṣyati* : *etasyaiva*=*asamartha-samāsasya nañ-samāsasya gamakasya sādhutvaṁ bhaviṣyati*; *na*=*anyasya*[246]=*iti*. I.361.20–23 on 2.1.1.)

This indicates

(1) that as general rule, P granted sanction only to syntactically compact or well-knit compounds, and Ptj too tried to be strict in following the general line of P's sanction;

(2) that, however, a tendency had started gradually growing among the people to form more and more compounds that were not compact units, and Ptj had to stamp as correct quite a number (' *bahūni* ') of such cases that had got fixed in the usage of his time: this he did probably by drawing an authoritative indication (*Jñāpaka*) from P himself; and

(3) that, nevertheless, he was making an effort not to extend this sanction beyond a certain (' *kasyacit* ') limit, to each and every such new formation, and thus to discourage the tendency of the times.

The form is not attested in literature.

---

[245] See : ".....it seems that the word *gamaka* belongs to the non-technical language. *Gamakatva* : 'ability to express (the same meaning)', as the non-technical principle underlying compound-formation in daily usage, must have been silently assumed by grammarians also." — S. D. JOSHI, *Patañjali's Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya* : *Samarthāhnika*, University of Poona, Poona, 1968, p. vii.

[246] This denies sanction to forms like *akiṁcitkurvāṇa-*, *amāṣaṁharamāṇa-* and *agādhādutsṛṣṭa-*, mentioned only once in *M* at I. 361.19 and not attested in literature.

A-3. GENERAL SEMASIOLOGY OF THE KRTYA FORMS

Obsn 52 : (i) P, Kty and Ptj, probably all, had in their usage the Kṛtya forms in the non-*Praiṣādi* senses as well as in the *Praiṣādi* senses.

(ii) Ptj had in his usage the forms, *busopendhya-*, *tṛṇopendhya-* and *ghana-ghātya-*; but it is not definitely known that P and Kty too used these.

The Kṛtya-s were declared by P to be bearing in general the significance of an object or of an action. (See ...... *karmaṇi ca bhāve ca* ...... 3.4.69, *tayor eva kṛtya-kta-khalarthāḥ* 3.4.70.) Yet, they were stated by him to be expressing three senses of " direction ", " permission " and " arrival of the proper time " (*praiṣātisargaprāptakaleṣu*[247] *kṛtyāś ca*, 3.3.163) which, together with the senses other than these, made up the broad significance in which the Kṛtya-s were stated generally by him. (See *M* : *aviśeṣeṇa vihitāḥ kṛtyās*; *te praiṣādiṣu bhaviṣyanty, anyatra ca.* II. 166.24-25.) Why P did so has been discussed, and finally justified on technical grounds,[248] by Kty; and he is followed by Ptj.

This suggests

(1) that both Kty as well as Ptj had no objection to understanding the Kṛtya forms other than in the *Praiṣādi* senses although P had mentioned them by 3.3.163 in the *Praiṣādi* senses; and

(2) that, if their interpretation of P's doing so were accepted, even P should be understood to be accepting the Kṛtya-s in the non-*Praiṣādi* senses as well.

However, countinuity in the usage with the three cannot be taken for granted as far as the specific forms that Ptj has recorded in illustration of Kṛtya-s in the non-*Praiṣādi* senses.

Ptj observed in the contemporary usage currency of the three forms, *busopendhya-* " that can be kindled with chaff ", *tṛṇopendhya-* " that can be kindled with grass" and *ghana–ghātya–* "that has to be struck (in order to be broken, only) with a hammer". (*M* II.167.3.) These are said to be possessing no specific senses like the *Praiṣādi* ones.[249] The same forms are once again elsewhere illustrated by Ptj (I.386.11f.) on a Vt (2.1.33.1) as not implying any exaggerated sense. The first two forms are derivable with *ṇyat* from *upa–√indh–* "to kindle, ignite" (by 3.1.124) having respectively *busa–* and *tṛṇa–* as the Upapada–s in the instrumental sense. The third one is formed with *ṇyat* from *√han–* having *ghana–* as the Upapada in the sense of an instrument.[250]

---

[247] *KV* (226) : *preṣaṇaṁ 'praiṣaḥ'; kāmacārābhyanujñānam 'atisargaḥ'; nimittabhūtasya kālasyāvasaraḥ 'prāptakāla'-tā.*

[248] Succinctly presented by *KV* (l.c.) as : *"kimarthaṁ praiṣādiṣu kṛtyā vidhīyante ? na sāmānyena bhāvakarmaṇor vihitā eva te praiṣādiṣv anyatra ca bhaviṣyanti ?" "viśeṣa-vihitena=anena loṭā bādhyante." "vāsarūpavidhinā bhaviṣyanti ?" "evaṁ tarhi jñāpayati, 'stryadhikārāt pareṇa vāsarūpa-vidhir nāvaśyaṁ bhavati'=iti."*

Now, *busá–* is found to occur in the Veda (*RV* 10.27.24) to be possessing the general sense of "water" (cp. *Nigh* 1.12 and *Nir* 5.19) or to mean "mist, vapour (?)[251] or drizzling rain". But this form is differentiated by P. Tedesco[252] and later by Mayrhofer[253] from *busa–* "chaff, bits of chopped hay and straw" of *KauSū* (14.15 : °*tuṣa–busa*°) which has been fixed anterior to P.[254] This latter one that we want occurs further in *Suśruta* (2.42.2); is found in the *tṛṇādi-gaṇa*[255] (mentioned at 4.2.80); is found finally in the adverbial compounds like *khalebusam* recorded in the *tiṣṭhadgu–prabhṛti–gaṇa* (at 2.1.17); and is probably at the base of the idiomatic form, *yava–busa–*, mentioned by P at 4.3.48.[256] *busa–* is again to be found used by Ptj with a pun on the word–order in *alaṁ* (–) *busānāṁ yātā* (I.14.14, III.388.10). — As for *tṛṇa–*, it is well–known to the Veda and to Kty. — *ghana–* is derived by P in the sense of "solidity" or "a solid mass" (*mūrti*)[257]; however, in the sense of an instrument he is found to derive specifically only *ayo–ghana–*, *vi–ghana–* and *dru–ghana–* (or *dru–ghaṇa–*)[258], but not *ghana–* "a cudgel, club, mallet." Still, as *ghana–* in the sense of a weapon is found in *RV* (1.33.4, 36.16, 63.5, 9.97.16) and in

---

[249] See Kaiy (251 b) : *busopendhyam iti : agnistokaṁ busena jvalanīyam iti vastu-svarūpa-kathanaṁ, na tu praiṣādipratipattiḥ. ghanaghātyam iti : ghanena lohādinā ghātyam iti kaṭhinatvād ity arthaḥ.*

[250] This is comparable with the form, *śva-ghātya-*, (for which see Obsn **40**), where, however, the Upapada, *śvan-*, is in the agent sense.

[251] See *BSOS* (1937) 9.41^{5} from "Indo-arica I: Sanskrit *púṣpa-* and *púṣya-*" by R. L. Turner.

[252] *Lg* (1946) 22. 189f. from "Sanskrit *bāṣpa-* 'Tears'."

[253] *EtW* (1963) II.440-442.

[254] See (1) A. B. Keith, *The Veda of the Black Yajus School entitled Taittiriya Sanhita*, Part 1, HOS. 18, 1914 : Introduction, p. clxvii; (2) Ram Gopal, *India of Vedic Kalpasūtras*, 1959, Ch. IV (The Age of the Sūtras), p. 82.

[255] Even in its reconstruction by Birwe (189). But in his review on Birwe's book, Palsule wonders why *busa-* was accepted in that Gaṇa : see p. 184 from *ABORI* (1965) 46.183-85.

[256] It is also found in *Divy* (8.6, 19,20) in the compound, *busa-plāvī*, which is understood to mean by P. L. Vaidya there (Gl. 540) as "a lady reaping field-produce", but earlier by Edgerton (*BHSDi* 401) inexactly as "something disagreeable (hard, or foul, offensive) to eat."

[257] With *ap* after √*han-* changed to *ghan*, by *mūrtau ghanaḥ* (3.3.77).

[258] *karaṇe 'yo-vi-druṣu*, 3.3.82.

AV (10.4.9), he can be taken to be acknowledging *ghana–* as one of the components in the forms derived by him at 3.3.82. — ***upendhya–*** or the root ***upa-√indh-*** at its base, or another form, ***upeddha–*** "kindled", derived from the same root and mentioned at one place by Ptj (I.51.7, 8), is not attested in literature, Vedic or classical. But it does not differ in meaning from the root ***√indh–*** which is at its base and which is of frequent occurrence in the Veda. — The form *ghātya–* is earlier seen to be derived by the rules of P. (See Obsn 39.)

The foregoing analysis tends to indicate that none of the three compounds can be necessarily taken as a new formation at the time of Ptj or even at the time of Kty, as it seems not unlikely that they existed in the usage even at the time of P. However, it is not possible to make a definite and conclusive statement in the matter based only on the fact that an independent place has been found recorded in earlier usages to the components of those compounds which are noted in the usage of Ptj.[259]

None of the three compounds is attested in literature.

---

[259] Cp. for a similar phenomenon, Obsns **28**, **40**.

B. THE TṚJĀDI-ENDING FORMATIONS

B–1 GENERAL SIGNIFICANCE OF TṚJĀDI-ENDING FORMS

Obsn 53: (i) In general, P used forms ending in the Tṛjādi suffixes freely or as denoting any time.

(ii) Some predecessors or contemporaries of Kty used them only in the sense of the present, and had in their usage forms 'like' *adhyāyaka–* and *vedādhyāya–* conveying only the present.

(iii) In general Kty's usage showed currency of such forms conveying the sense irrespective of any time.

(iv) Ptj's usage agreed with that of Kty and he used *carcā–pāra–* and *śamanī–pāra–* likewise.

On the so-called "Tṛj–ādi"[260] (or rather : Ṇvul–ādi[261] suffixes—i.e. all those Kṛt suffixes onward from the rule *ṇvul–tṛcau* (3.1.133) — P did not find the necessity to put a general restriction in respect of time : wherever certain of them were found to convey only a particular time, at that place he restricted those to the particular sphere of time[262] : while all the others freely expressed any time in his usage.

Kty, however, records a view (3.1.133.3 : *tṛjādiṣu vartamānakālopādānam, adhyāyaka–vedādhyāyādyartham*) of some, based on the usage of all the Tṛjādi suffixes in the present tense only. To them (1) *adhyāyaka–* and (2) *vedādhyāya–* (ending in *ṇvul* and *aṇ* respectively) conveyed the senses, (1) "one who carries on study (at present)" and (2) "one who carries on a study of the Veda (at present)"; never, "one who did the study......" or "one who will be doing the study......" (cp. *adhītavaty adhyeṣyamāṇe vā mā bhūt,* II.91.8). These may be either the predecessors or the contemporaries of Kty.

---

[260] See fn. 99-(ii).

[261] Although *ṇvul* occurs first in the rule *ṇvul-tṛcau*, the term *tṛj-ādi*, that defines the limit of a sub-section of the Kṛt suffixes (as being apart from the Kṛtya sub-section), includes *ṇvul* also : for, *tṛc* in the term *tṛjādi* is to be understood for 'the whole rule containing *tṛc*' (i.e. as being *yogāpekṣa*). The term *tṛj-ādi* is used by Kty in preference to *ṇvul-ādi* probably for the sake of ease in pronunciation (*mukhasukhārtham*).

[262] Cf. For the past, *bhūte* (3.2.84); for the present, *vartamāne* (from 3.2.123); and for the future, *bhaviṣyati* (from 3.3.3).

Immediately thereafter, he goes on to refute the view, as probably he does not find such a phenomenon holding true uniformly for all the Tṛjādi suffixes; on the contrary, he probably finds the Tṛjādi suffixes to express in general, any time. His Vt embodying this reply is: *na vā, kālamātre darśanād anyeṣām* (3.1.133.4).

The text of *M* as we have it[263] shows the explanation of the argumentative part of the Vt (*kālamātre darśanād anyeṣām*) as follows: *kālamātre hy anye 'pi pratyayā dṛśyante. carcā-pāraḥ śamanī-pāraḥ.* (II.91.10.11). The MSS E, g and B, however omit the '(*a*) *pi*' here.

On a study of the possible implications of the explanatory line from Ptj, the point of Kty's argument appears to be this: that even other 'suffixes' (—i.e. even other Tṛjādi-ending **forms** showing suffixes other than those in *adhyāyaka-* and *vedādhyāya-* —) are found to express unspecified time, and that hence all the Tṛjādi sffixes cannot be restricted to the Present. The examples drawn by Ptj to illustrate the point in the reply of Kty are *carcā-pāra-* "one who masters the Carcā mode (of recitation)" and *śamanī-pāra-*[264] "one who masters the Śamanī mode (of recitation)".

Kty is found to repeat the examples, *vedādhyāya-*[264] and the like, at 3.2.1.1 where no restriction in respect of time is implied. This fact strengthens the idea that Kty's usage (and view) did not agree with that recorded by him in the previous Vt (3) here, indicating thereby the difference in the two types of usages.[264a] The usage recorded and refuted by Kty might have been current either shortly before him, or during his own times but in a locality different from his. But Kty's usage contained a large number of forms that expressed actions denoting time in general.

The fact that Ptj does not suggest any modification to the view of Kty indicates that the same situation continued in his time as well.

---

[263] About the doubtful and controversial nature of this part of the text and about the interpretations as well as the emendations suggested, see S. D. LADDU, "Kātyāyana's *Vārttika* on Pāṇini 3.1.133 and its Bearing on the Text of the *Mahābhāṣya*", *VIJ* (1966) 4.14-18.

[264] The three forms will be found discussed under Obsn **98,** and *adhyāyaka-* under Obsn **56.**

[264a] For a similar view on the Vt-s containing statements introduced with *'na vā'*, see Vedapati MISHRA, *Vyākarana Vārttika — Eka Samīkshātmaka Adhyayana* (in Hindi), Varanasi, 1970, pp. 85-104.

B-2. FORMS APPEARING LIKE KṚTYA-S

Obsn 54 : (i) P, Kty and Ptj, all, used *vrajyā–* and *ijyā–* in the action sense. Perhaps they used *samajyā–* also in that sense.

(ii) In the location sense P used none of these forms.

(iii) Kty used *vrajyā –* and *ijya–* (but probably not *samajyā–*) in the location sense.

(iv) Ptj used *samajyā–*, but not *vrajyā–* and *ijyā–*, in the location sense.

A few non–Kṛtya formations[265] formed with the suffix *kyap* are enjoined by P in three rules (3.3.98–100) outside the Kṛtya–section. The action sense of the suffix stated (by ‘*bhāve*’) in the first of these rules (viz. *vraja–yajor bhāve kyap*) is to be expected to govern the following two rules also (viz. *saṁjñāyāṁ samaja–niṣada–nipata–mana–vida–ṣuñ–śīṅ–bhṛñ–iṇaḥ* and *kṛñaḥ śa ca*), thus establishing *vrajyā–*, *ijyā–*, *samajyā–* etc. in the action sense. But the action sense is found present in very few formations formed by these rules (such as *bhṛtya–* “service” by 3.3.99 from √*bhṛ–*,[266] and attested in *yá eṣāṁ bhṛtyám ṛṇádhat sá jīvāt RV* 1.84.16); while senses like location are found in some cases.[267]

So: Kty steps out (3.3.98.1 : *kyabvidhir adhikaraṇe ca*) to add the location sense (to the earlier action sense) in the suffix *kyap*; and Ptj illustrates it with a noun (Saṁjñā) form (derived by the next Sūtra), *samajyā–* “ a place where they meet, an assembly–hall. ”

---

[265] For, falling outside the range of the Kṛtya Section (3.1.96-132), they are technically beyond the jurisdiction of the rules applicable to Kṛtya formations (*Kṛtya-pradeśa*) such as *kṛtyair adhikārthavacane* (2.1.33), *kṛtyānāṁ kartari vā* (2.3.71) etc.

[266] So, the fem. noun (— a Kṛtya-form —) *bhāryā-* “(to be supported or maintained, hence) a wife,” carrying the object sense, is formed with *ṇyat*, as a corollary to the fem. noun *bhṛtyā-* “service”, carrying the action sense and formed with *kyap*. Thus, ‘Apara’ putting this is quoted by Ptj : *striyāṁ bhāvādhikāro 'sti, tena bhāryā prasidhyati* (II.86.8). This line (that refers to 3.3.99) is, however, explained by *KV* (214) as *bhāvādhikāro bhāvavyāpāro vācyatvena vivakṣito, na tu śāstrīyo 'dhikāraḥ;* that means, “the partaking of the idea of action in 3.3.99 from 3.3.98) (that is mentioned by ‘Apara’) is to be understood not as a governing rule of the science, but as the meaning (of a particular form, such as that of *bhṛtyā-* here).” So too NBh (147a) : *“bhṛñ-viṣaye” ‘bhāve’ iti vartate ity arthaḥ.*

[267] See NBh (l.c.) for this and other senses.

Now, Kty's note adding the location sense (to the action sense of P) in *kyap* is actually on the rule, *vraja-yajor bhāve kyap* (3.3.98); Ptj explains it there itself; but the illustration (*samajyā-*) which he cites is from the **next** rule, *saṁjñāyāṁ samaja°* (3.3.99).[268] This gives rise to some important implications for the usage of the times.

There is no doubt that Kty's note, as it is placed in *M*, refers primarily to the rule, *vraja-yajor bhāve kyap*,[269] and then (only with a strong doubt) to the next rule. That means that Kty had noticed in his usage the forms, *vrajyā-* and *ijyā-*, in the location sense (*vrajyā-* "on or in which one goes, a road etc";[270] *ijyā-* "the sacrificial ground"), in addition to their action sense (*vrajyā-* "going, gait"; *ijyā-* "a sacrifice") earlier noted by P. It may also be noted here that Yāska has used *vrajyā-* once where it is an action noun. (Cf. *Nir* 1.1: *upakrama-prabhṛty apavarga-paryantaṁ mūrtaṁ sattva-bhūtaṁ sattva-nāmabhiḥ. vrajyā paktir iti.*) Sarup (p.5) has translated it as "going". — Understanding of *samajyā-* as well to have denoted the location sense in Kty's usage rests upon taking his note to be applicable to the following rule also (3.3.100) by which *samajyā-* is derived.

As for Ptj, his silence about the location sense of *vrjyā-* and *ijyā-* probably points to the absence of these forms carrying that sense in his usage. He has used *vrajyā-* only once and as a '*dravyavat bhāva*' or action-noun (*kārakasya vrjayā* I.417.17), and *ijyā-* twice similarly (III. 57.23, 58.11). It is obvious that he used *samajyā-* in the location sense as he explains it like that (*samajanti tasyāṁ samajyā*, II.152.23). Whether he used that form in the action sense 'also' ('*ca*' from 3.3.99.1 referring to that) is not quite clear. Even his gloss '*samajanam*' on the only other mention of *samajyā-* in *M* (I.488.9f. on 2.4. 56.1) can be derived with *lyuṭ* either in the action sense (by *lyuṭ ca*, 3.3.115) or in the location sense (by *karaṇa=adhikaraṇayoś ca*, 3.3.117). But lack of objection from him should indicate that he had *samajyā-* in the action sense as well in his usage.

---

[268] Kaiy (233b) refers Kty's note to the next rule (*uttarasūtre iti bhāvaḥ*); and NBh (l.c.) approvingly gives as its reason the fact that Ptj has illustrated the note with a form from the next rule (*bhāṣye tadviṣayodāharaṇa-dānād iti bhāvaḥ*).

[269] For, then it satisfies his principle, as discovered by Kielhorn, of his first Vt on a Sūtra that is taken up for discussion repeating a part thereof (here '*kyap*') by way of reference. Had Kty wished to refer by his note to the next rule alone, he would have worded his note somewhat like '*saṁjñāyāṁ kyabvidhir adhikaraṇe ca*' or '*kyab-vidhau saṁjñāyām adhikaraṇe ca*', containing a Pratīka in reference to that rule. Cp. his nearby Vt, *ab-vidhau niści-grahaṇam anarthakam* ..... (3.3.58.1), containing '*ap*' from the uncommented rule 3.3.57 and '*niści*' from 3.3.58.

[270] Curiously enough "a theatre" is one of the senses recorded of this word as early as 1889 in V. S. Apte's *The Practical Sanskrit-English Dictionary* (p. 842). However, although the source of the usage is not recorded, it must not be an old one.

However, P's total silence about the location sense throughout the three rules on *kyap* (3.3.98–100) suggests that he did not have the form in his usage. This is inspite of the fact that such an instance is found in *KauSū* which has been seen to be anterior to P[271] : *atha yatraitad grāme vā* (') *vasāne vā* (') *gniśaraṇe vā samajyāyāṁ vā*(')*vadīryeta catasro dhenava upakḷptā bhavanti śvetā kṛtsnā rohiṇī surūpā caturthī* (120.1;Adh. 13; pp. 272f.).

vrajyā- and *samajyā-* are not attested in classical Sanskrit literature; *ijyā-* is nowhere attested.

---

[271] See fn. 254 on Obsn **52**.

B-3. THE TṚJĀDI-ENDING FORMS IN GENERAL

<< 1 >> FORMS IN -*AKA*$_1$ (*ṆVUL*)

(Sūtra : 3.1.133)

Obsn 55 : (i) P probably used the suffix *ṇvul* after transitive as well as intransitive roots.

(ii) Later, probably some predecessors of Kty used the suffix after transitive roots only.

(iii) But Kty used it after all types of roots.

(iv) So too Ptj, who cites *āsaka*- and *śāyaka*- from his usage.

By his *ṇvul-tṛcau* (3.1.133) P enjoins unrestricted applicability of the suffix *ṇvul*. On this Kty (Vt 1 : *ṇvuli sakarmaka-grahaṇam*) records a view requiring a limited mention of only transitive roots before this suffix. (According to this, we cannot get forms like *āsaka*- and *śāyaka*- from the intransitive roots, √*ās*- " to sit " and √*śī*- " to lie down ", respectively.)

But Kty (Vt 2 : *na vā, dhātumātrād darśanān ṇvulaḥ*) refutes this suggestion, saving that he finds *ṇvul* after all types of roots (transitive as well as intransitive). — That this is the view held by him is very soon impliedly endorsed by him when he states (3.1.134.1) : *aj ' api ' sarva-dhātubhyaḥ*, where '*api*' obviously means ' besides (*ṇvul* and *tṛc*)'.

Ptj accepts the verdict of Kty and cites by way of illustration, the forms, *āsaka*- " one who sits, an attendant " and *śāyaka*- " one who lies down (as an attendant) ", in the following[272] connected usages respectively :
ime ' sya=āsakāḥ, utthitā āsakā vaiśravaṇasya (II.91.4, 5), and *ime 'sya śāyakāḥ* (II.91.5).

That this is the view of Ptj also is further endorsed by the fact that he considers *ṇvul* to be a ' general ' suffix. (See : *ṇvul-tṛj-aca utsargāḥ*, II.78.16.)

The forms are not attested in literature.

Obsn 56 : (i) P probably knew and perhaps even used the form *adhyāyaka*-. Kty used it.

---

[272] Later in a different context also at II. 140.12.

(ii) They might have also known and used *kāraka-*, *hāraka-*, *yājaka-* and *pācaka-*.

(iii) Ptj used all these, and *vikṣepaka-* and **vilekhaka-*.

P might have known the form, *adhyāyaka-* "one who studies (the Veda)", as it occurs in *TUp* : *yuvā syāt sādhu-yuvā 'dhyāyakaḥ* (2nd (*Brahma-*) *vallī*, 8th *khaṇḍa*), and possibly used it also. Kty certainly used it, as he is found to discuss the time as it signified to his predecessors or contemporaries and to himself (3.1.133.4 : see Obsn **53**).

The forms, *kāraka-* "one who does" and *yājaka-* "one who performs a sacrifice", occur in *MBhr* and *Rām*, *pācaka* "one who cooks" in *MBhr*, and *hāraka-* "one who takes away" in *Manu*. So it may be said that both P and Kty knew and even used these simple forms. Ptj makes a free use of the forms, *kāraka-*, *hāraka-*, and *yājaka-*, which shows their large frequency in his usage.

The form *vikṣepaka-* "scatterer" is first used by Ptj (II.78.17, 21), and **vilekhaka-* "one who writes or scratches" is also implied by him (loc. cit.); but neither of these is attested in literature. *adhyāyaka-* is not found used in classical Sanskrit literature.

Obsn 57 : P, Kty and Ptj, probably all, used the forms, *nartaka-*, *khānaka-* and *rañjaka-*, while denoting casual or non-artistic doing of the acts.

P had laid down the suffix *ṣvun* (3.1.145 : *śilpini ṣvun*) to denote in the agent the specialised sense of an artisan of an act expressed by the preceding root: otherwise, to denote an agent who was a casual doer of the act, he used the general suffix *ṇvul* (3.1.133) after the root. (But, the use of the suffix *ṣvun* bearing the specialised sense of an artisan was restricted by Ptj only to the roots, √*nṛt-*, √*khan-* and √*rañj-*(*nṛti-khani-rañjibhya iti vaktavyam*, II.92.20); after all other roots, Ptj's usage showed only *ṇvul* in the artisan sense as well as in the ordinary sense.)

This points out that, in the use of the suffix *ṇvul* in the sense of a casual or non-artistic doer of an act, there was seen consistency and no change in the usage of Ptj after the time of P. Usage, thus, seems to have been continuous in this regard from P to Ptj. By way of illustration the forms, *nartaka-*, *khānaka-* and *rañjaka-*, can be cited. (The respective feminine forms would be *nartika-*, *khānikā-* and *rañjikā-* by 4.1 41, and *nartakī-*, *khānakī-* and *rañjakī-* by 4.1.48.)

The form, *nartaka-* "one dancing casually", appears in *Rām* and *MBhr*, *khānaka-* "one digging casually" in *VarBS* (89.9 : *kuḍyam utkirati veśmano* *yadā tatra khānāka–bhayaṁ bhavet tadā* /), and *rañjaka–* " one washing or painting casually " in *Manu* (4.216). *khānaka–* is also used by Ptj in the compound, *kūpa-khānaka–* (I.11.7).

For a fuller discussion on the forms and for further attestation, see Obsn 96.)

Obsn 58 : (i) P and probably Kty also, did not use *hvāyaka–* and its feminine denoting the non–artistic or casual act.

(ii) Ptj probably used them.

A detailed discussion at Obsn **96** will show that Ptj, in all likelihood, used *hvā́yaka–* "an invoker" / v.l. *vā́yaka–* " a weaver " showing *ṇvul* (feminines: *hvā́yikā–* and *hāyakí–*, or *vā́yikā–* and *vāyakí–*, respectively by 4.1 41 and 4. 1.48) to denote an agent doing the act casually or in a non–artistic manner. Theoretically, P and Kty had no expressed difference of usage. But non–attestation of *hvāyaka–/vāyaka–* in early literature shows that it must not be current with P or Kty. Further had it been used by them, they must have also had **hvāka–/*vāka–* (with *ṣvun* by 3.1.145) to denote an artistic doer of that act, but this latter is nowhere noted in usage. This means that *hvāyaka–/vāyaka–* also was a new form developed in the usage at the time of Ptj.

Obsn 59 : (i) P used **prāvaka–*, *sāraka–* and *lāvaka–* to denote doers of single acts.

(ii) Kty and Ptj used them to denote only clumsy doers either of single or of repeated acts.

P derived, with the suffix *vun*, from the roots, *√pru–*, *√sṛ–* and *√lū–*, the forms, *pravaka–* " one who goes or jumps ", *saraka–* " one who moves " and *lavaka–* " one who cuts, a reaper ", respectively, in the sense of repeaters of the acts. (*pru–sṛ–lvaḥ samabhihāre vun*, 3 1.149.) By implication, in the non–repetition sense, he used the forms, **prāvaka–*, *sāraka–* and *lāvaka–*, from the same roots but with the general suffix *ṇvul*.

But Kty, followed by Ptj, used forms like *pravaka–* only to denote excellent doers ('*sādhukāriṇi*' from Vt 1) of the acts. By implication, to express clumsy doers of the single or frequent acts denoted by these roots, they used only forms like **prāvaka–* showing *ṇvul*.

Of these latter type of forms, however, only *lāvaka–* is found used, and frequently so, in *M*. But that probably indicates that he had in use also the other two forms, **prāvaka–* and *sāraka–*.

The form *lāvaka–* is attested in *BĀrUp* and *KŚSū*; *sāraka–* is found used only late[373] (according to *PW* 7.948, in *KathāS* 73.122, *Bhāvaprakāśa* 5 and *Rājanighaṇṭa* 21:16); **prāvaka–* is not attested.

For a fuller discussion on the difference between the two sets of forms, see Obsn **97**.

Obsn 60: The form *parivrājaka-* continued to be in the usage from P to Ptj.

Ptj has once used the form, *parivrājikā-* " a female wandering religious mendicant " in the phrase, *śaṁkarā nāma parivrājikā* (II.100.6). It is derived with *ṇvul* from the root *pari-* √*vraj-*. At two other places he has used the masculine form, *parivrājaka-*, thus : (*gamyate*) *triviṣṭabdhakaṁ dṛṣṭvā parivrājaka iti*. (I.365.21, II. 125.14f.)

The form is also used by P in the rule, *maskara-maskariṇau veṇu-parivrājakayoḥ* (6.1.154), which gives the senses (viz. *veṇu* and *parivrājaka*) in which the extraordinary forms, *maskara-* and *maskarin-* (showing the *suḍ-āgama*[274]), were used. It is also found in the *yuvādi-gaṇa*[275] mentioned at 5.1.130. It is used in *Nir* (1.14, 2.8).

This shows that the form *parivrājaka-*, was in contiuuous use from P to Ptj. In literature it is found attested in *Rām*(3.47.8).

From the uses of the form in *M*, it appears that it carried **both** of the following literal senses : (i) " one who holds a bamboo-staff (*triviṣṭabdha*) (in hand)", (2) " one who exhorts people to desist from actions"(*mā kṛta karmāṇi, mā kṛta karmāṇi; śāntir vaḥ śreyasī=ity āha=ato maskrī*[276] *parivrājakaḥ* III. 96.13f. on 6.1.144).

---

[273] Though, only as a name of certain men, earlier in *Divy* (284.17,19).

[274] *KV* (498) : *māṅy upapade karotes tācchīlya inir nipātyate. māṅo hrasvatvaṁ suṭ ca tathaiva.*

[275] Also in its reconstruction by BIRWE (341).

[276] *KV* (l.c.) : *"mā"-karaṇa-śīlo 'ma-s-karī'.*

<< 2 >> FORMS IN –*TṚ*$_1$ (*TṚC*)

(Sūtra : 3.1.133)

Obsn 61 : (i) P knew the forms, *paktṛ*– and *rantṛ*–; it is not certain whether he knew *vikṣeptṛ*–, *āsitṛ*–, *śayitṛ*– and *āḍhyībhavitṛ*–

(ii) Kty probably used all the six.

(iii) Ptj used these and *ajaritṛ*– and *japitṛ*–; he also implies knowledge of the form **vilekhitṛ*–.

The form, *paktṛ*– " one who cooks ", occurs in the Veda and *MBhr*, and *rantṛ*–" one who plays or delights " in the Veda; hence P must have known them. He may or may not have known *vikṣeptṛ*– " scatterer " which occurs in *MBhr*; but Kty might have had all the three in his usage. Possibly they also used these as well as *āsitṛ*–, *śayitṛ*– and *āḍhyībhavitṛ*–. (P has used *āḍhya*– at 3.2.56, 57 and Kty at 1.1.72.9.)

Ptj makes use of the forms, *paktṛ*– (II.78.14), *vikṣeptṛ*– (II.78.17,21, also implying there **vilekhitṛ*– " one who writes or scratches "), *ajaritṛ*– " not wearing off, long-lasting " (in *ajaritā kambalaḥ* 83.9), *āsitṛ*– " who sits " (II.91.2), *śayitṛ*– " who lies down " (II.91.2), *rantṛ*– (in *stambe rantā* II.99.22), *japitṛ*– " producing the humming sound " (in *karṇe japiiā* II.99.22), and *āḍhyībhavitṛ*– " becoming wealthy " (II.105.18), — the last three and *ajaritṛ*– only once.

None of these, excepting *paktṛ*–, *rantṛ*– and *vikṣeptṛ*–, is found attested in literature.

<<3>> FORMS IN -A_1 (*AC*)

(Sūtra-s : 3.1.134, 3.2.9-15)

Obsn 62 : (i) P used the suffix *ac* after roots 'like √*pac*-'.

(ii) Kty used it after all types of roots.

(iii) So too Ptj.

P has enjoined the suffix *ac* after roots 'like √*pac*-' ('*pac-ādi*' in *nandi-grahi-pac-ādibhyo lyu-ṇiny-acaḥ*, 3.1.134). The actual list of such forms showing the final *ac* is given in the illustrative group (Ākṛti-gaṇa) headed by the form *paca*- ('*paca-ādi*'-*gaṇa*).

By the time of Kty., however, the suffix *ac* had not remained restricted to the few cases of roots 'like √*pac*-' but was used quite extensively i.e. after all types of roots. That probably[278] made Kty frame his Vt (3.1.134.1), *aj api sarva-dhātubhyaḥ*.

The same situation must have contiuned at the time of Ptj, as he does not modify the point of the Vt but explains it with illustrations. This is further endorsed by the fact that he considers *ac* to be a 'general' suffix. (See : *evaṁ tarhi ṇvul-tṛj-aca utsargāh*, II.78.16.)[279]

Obsn 63 : P, Kty and Ptj, all, used the form *paca*-.

P (3.1.134), we know (see Obsn 62), enjoins the suffix *ac* after roots at the base of forms listed in the *pacādi-gaṇa*, and Kty refers to these (*paca-ādi*) forms at 3.1.134.2. As this form-list is merely an illustrative group (Ākṛti-gaṇa) with the head-form, *paca*-, it cannot show to us the state of its content as it exactly was at the time of P. We can, thus, be sure of the currency of only the head-form *paca*- in P's and Kty's usage.

---

[277] These and others in the Sūtra are not groups of roots beginning with √*nand*-, √*grah*- and √*pac*- as placed in *DhP*, but roots that are at the base of the forms *nandana*-, *grāhin*- and *paca*- respectively, that head certain groups of forms. See *KV* (167) : *nandi-grahi-pacādayaś ca na dhātupāṭhataḥ sanniviṣṭā gṛhyante. kiṁ tarhi ? nandana-ramaṇa=ityevamādiṣu prātipadikagaṇeṣu apoddhṛtya prakṛtayo nirdiśyante.*

[278] The justifications given by Kty in Vt 2 of P's 'mention (in the Sūtra) of (roots) like √*pac*-' (*pacādy-anukramaṇam*) as taking *ac*, in the face of the totally different situation of his own time as noted by him in Vt 1, are purported to defend P's drafting of the rule.

[279] See the Kārikā quoted in fn. 282 on Obsn **65**.

Ptj is found to make an explicit use of this form, bringing out its agent-sense, " one who cooks, a cook ", in *pacati=iti pacaḥ* (II.78.14, 94.18–19).

The form is found attested in *AV–P* (5.40.3) thus : *agniḥ pacaṁ rakṣatu odanam*. Later *KV* on 6.2.157, 158 notes it in *a–paca–*.

Obsn 64 : (i) P, Kty and Ptj, all, used the forms, *nada–* and *nadī–*.

(ii) P's and Kty's use of the forms, *cora-* and *corī–* is not known; but it is not unlikely that they used those.

(iii) Ptj used all these.

The forms, *nada–* as well as (its fem.) *nadī–* " roarer bellower, (hence) a river ", occur in the Veda. So P knew them well. He has also used them in his rules (2.1.20, 3.1.115, 4.4.111,5.4.110, 8.3.89). Probably he derived them from √*nad–* with *ac*. But it cannot be said with certainty that he used *cora–* and its feminine *corī–*, "a stealer", derived from √*cur–* with *ac*, as they generally do not occur in the Veda : *cora–* occurs only in *TĀrPariśiṣṭa* (10.64). But the forms are quite common in the classical literature.

Kty has also used *nadī–* independently of P at 2.4.84.1. Hence it can be said that one of his two justifications (3.1.134.2) for P's use of the word *pacādi* in the rule *nandi*° (3.1.134.),[280] viz. *anubandhāsañjanārtham* (cf. *ṭ* in *nadaṭ* of the *pacādi–gaṇa* getting the fem. suffix *ṅīp* by *ṭiḍḍhāṇañ*°, (4.1.15), actually yields the form *nadī–* of his usage. The same, however, cannot be said of the forms, *cora–* and *corī–*, the latter of which is obtained from the listing of *coraṭ* in the *pacādi–gaṇa*; for, the Gaṇa is merely illustrative (its strength always remaining fluid) and hence their use by either P or Kty is of uncertain knowledge. *KauArth* shows the use of *cora–*, and *GRM* (1.46, comm.) that of *corī–*.

Ptj knew all the four, as he illustrates Kty's statement (3.1.134.2) with *nadī–* and *corī–*.

Obsn 65 : (i) It cannot be said whether P or Kty definitely knew the forms, *jāra–bharā–*, *śva–paca* and (its fem.) *śva–pacā–*.

(ii) Ptj used them.

The form, *jāra–* "a consumer, a paramour ", is well known to the Veda and to Kty (*dāra–jārau kartari ṇiluk ca; karaṇe vā* : 3.3.20.4 , 5). But *bhara–* (from √*bhṛ–* with *ac*) preceded in a compound by *jāra–*, i.e. the fem. form, *jāra–bharā–* " maintaining a paramour, an adulteress " (from **jāra–bhara–*), is not known to the Veda; so it is not certain if P knew it. It is not attested in literature. — The form, *śva-paca–* " who cooks dogs, (hence :) a person of a low caste", occurs in *ŚGSū* (2.14), *Manu* (10.51) and frequently in *MBhr.*[281] We cannot, however, be sure from that of P's use of it in his speech.

---

[280] See fn. 278 on Obsn. 62.

Kty (3.1.134.2: *pacādy-anukramaṇam...... apavāda-bādhanārthaṁ ca*) justifies P's restricted use of only roots like √*pac-* as taking *ac* (in *nandi*°, 3.1.134) on an additional ground that it gives us the wanted (feminine) forms (cf. *jāra-bharā-* and *śva-pacā-* (from **jāra-bhara-* and *śva-paca-* respectively), to the exclusion of forms showing Karmopapada *aṇ*; for, the *pacādi-gaṇa* shows in it the *ac*-ending (Karmopapada) forms, *jāra-bharā-* and *śva-paca-*.[282] —But, it is illusory to infer from this P's and Kty's definite knowledge of the forms, *jāra-bhara-* and *śva-paca-* (and their feminines), for we have no idea of what forms were actually included in the *pacādi-gaṇa* at the time of P and Kty, it being an illustrative and ever-expanding group. Thus there is an equal probability of P's and Kty's knowledge as well as of their ignorance of these forms.

---

[281] The idea can be traced to the line from *RV* (4.18.13) : *ávartyā śúna āntrā́ṇi pece.*

[282] Thus, P's reference to the *pacādi-gaṇa* in his rule enjoining *ac*, makes possible to get *ac* found at the end of forms included in the Gaṇa, such as our *jāra-bharā-* (also showing the fem. suffix *ṭāp*) and *śva-paca-*. With this *ac*. the latter one further yields the form, *śva-pacā-*, in the feminine (with the suffix *ṭāp*). — Without this reference of P, however, the forms would first have been **jāra-bhāra-* and *śva-pāka-* (*ku-tva* by 7.3.53) with the suffix *aṇ* at the end, as a root with a preceding Karmopapada (like *jāra-* or *śvan-* here) takes the (exception) suffix *aṇ* by the rule, *karmaṇy aṇ* (3.2.1). Then, they would have shown **jāra-bhārī-* and *śva-pākī-* in the fem., getting the suffix *ṅīp* by *ṭiḍḍhāṇañ*° (4.1.15).

It may be noted that *śva-pāka-* (with some other similar forms) is actually mentioned in the *nyaṅkvādi-gaṇa* (referred to at 7.3.53), and that it occurs in *Manu* (10.19) and frequently in *MBhr* (cp 6.27.18 : *śuni caiva śvapāke ca paṇḍitāḥ samadarśinaḥ, BGītā* 5.18), **though** not once in *M*. The following Kārikā, found quoted in some editions of *KV* (167) at the end of the comment on 3.1.134 (but not taken note of by the commentators), however, appears to be definitely against establishing the form *śva-pāka-* showing application of the suffix *aṇ* after √*pac-* :

aj-vidhiḥ sarva-dhātubhyaḥ; paṭhyante ca pacādayaḥ/
aṇbādhanārtham eva syāt; sidhyanti śvapacādayaḥ//

Now, all the commentaries (Kaiy, *Ny*, *PdM*, *SK*, *TattvaB*) accept *śva-pāka-*, either expressly meaning it to be an "alternative form" to *śva-paca-* ('*pakṣe*' Kaiy 153, *PdM* 529) or impliedly so; for, it was seen included in the *nyaṅkyādi-gaṇa* referred to at 7.3.53 as showing the *ku-tva* (to **śva-pāca-*). Their acceptance of *śva-pāka-* was probably also based on its occurrence in *Manu* and in *MBhr*. — But Kty and Ptj seem to be against establishing it thus with *aṇ*. So too *KV* (167) Karikā at 3.1.134; however, on the *nyaṅkvādi-sūtra* (7.3.53) *KV* (666) refers to the form (with three such others) as showing "*karmopapadād aṇ-pratayayaḥ*". Further, the form **jārabhārī-* also is not sanctioned by Kty or Ptj.

All this gives rise to the following possibilities or suspicions :

(1) Kty and Ptj might not be aware of the inclusion of *śva-pāka-* in the *nyaṅkvādi-gaṇa* or of its frequent use in *MBhr* (this latter being highly improbable).

(2) Or, being aware, they might not be favourable to give sanction to the formation.

(3) The discrepancy in *KV* (167, 666) about sanctioning the formation may be due either to the different authorship within *KV* or to the spuriousness of the Kārikā itself at 3.1.134.

Ptj, on the contrary, shows definite knowledge and use of these forms although he cites them only once in illustration of Kty's justification (3.1.134 2).

Obsn 66 : P, Kty and Ptj, all, used the forms, *bhava-* and *śarva-*, (or at least the first one) in the agent sense.

While P (3.1.134) restricts the use of *ac* after roots at the base of forms from the *pacādi-gaṇa* only, Kty extends its use after all the roots (Vt 1 : *aj api sarva-dhātubhyaḥ*). Ptj accepts the change introduced by Kty and, in illustration, cites the forms, *bhava-* " one who exists; (name of) the god Śiva (as 'existing constantly' ?) " and[283] *śarva-*[284] " one who kills; (name of) the god Śiva "; these are not listed in the *pacādi-gaṇa,* and are yet to be derived, according to Ptj, with *ac* from the roots, √*bhū-* " to exist, become " (so too *KV* at 3.1.143) and √*śarv-* " to hurt, kill ", respectively.

Now, *śarva-* is known to the Veda and is even used by P in the rule, *indra-varuṇa-bhava-śarva-rudra°...... ° ācāryāṇām ānuk* (4.1.49). The root √*śarv-*, though not found in the Veda, is found in *DhP* (585 *śarva hiṁsāyām*). So it is to be assumed that P knew the root, unless evidence to the contrary is produced. Yet it cannot be said definitely that he derived *śarva-* (in the etymological sense) from √*śarv-* with *ac*; he might even have taken the form as a ready-made one and possibly derived it with some Uṇādi suffix.[285]

The form, *bhava-*, meaning Śiva, is used in the Veda; and, in the sense of "coming into existence (from), arising (from), " it is used in literature probably first in *Rām* (though at the end of a compound) in *gandhān nānāpuṣpa-bhavān* (2.88.14) and *vanavāsa-bhavair duḥkhaiḥ* (vol. 2, p.176, 703*, 1.2). P has used it in both the meanings : as Śiva in the *indra-varuṇa°* rule (4.4.111) and in the (agent) sense of "arising" in the rules, *tatra bhavaḥ* (4.3.53) and *bhave chandasi* (4.4.110). So he certainly derived it (at least in the latter meaning) with the agent suffix *ac*.

Ptj cites the two forms to illustrate the use of *ac* " after all (types of) roots ", i.e. even after the roots other than those that are at the base of forms listed in the *pacādi-gaṇa*. From this it is clear that the forms, *bhava-* and *śarva-*, were not handed down in Ptj's time as members of the *pacādi-gaṇa*. It is likely that the same was true earlier also at the time of Kty, although his Vt (*aj api sarva-dhātubhyaḥ*) is only of a theoretical nature and not recording concrete instances from actual usage. That indicates prevalence of the same state of the Gaṇa earlier at the time of P also.

---

[283] That, instead of only one example *bhavaḥ* (when, *śarvaḥ* would be merely its gloss), two distinct examples are cited here by Ptj, is indicated by the Vt-expression, *sarva-dhātubhyaḥ* "after all the roots", that would ordinarily require in the *M*-explanation illustration with more than one root.

[284] The v.11. *śavaḥ* and *savaḥ*, each shown by a single ms., need not be taken seriously.

[285] By *tābhyām anyatra=uṇādayaḥ* (3.4.75); and perhaps *bhava-* also as a member of the *bhīmādi* Ākṛti-gaṇa, and as *bhavaty asmād iti bhavaḥ* by *bhīmādayo 'pādāne* (3.4.74).

But then, if P is supposed to have used *bhava-* and *śarva-* in the agent sense (and known to have used at least *bhava-* as an adjective), why should his *pacādi-gaṇa* be supposed not to include *bhava-* and *śarva-* when they show no other suffix than *ac*?. The answer can be that the *pacādi-gaṇa* at the time of P did probably contain these forms, but that later (— we do not know with certainty if that was at the time of Kty —) somehow they were lost from the Gaṇa. That is why P did not separately mention them and why Ptj was required to mention those (in addition to the *pacādi* forms) as showing *ac*.

At any rate, it can be said that the forms, *bhava-* and *śarva-*, were actually used by P, Kty and Ptj, and that they present no history in the usage. (This is corroborated by the fact that *bhava-* and *śarva-* are frequently spoken of together, chiefly in *AV*.) — Less likely, this was true only of *bhava-* (*śarva-* being merely a gloss on it by Ptj); and Ptj understood *bhava-*, (even) when in the sense of Śiva ('*śarva-*'), to be in the agent sense as "one who kills or destroys".

Obsn 67 : (i) P perhaps used the compounds ending in *grāha-* and having an object as the Upapada.

(ii) Kty and Ptj used the following Upapada-compounds ending in *graha-*: *śakti-graha-*, *lāṅgala-*^{0}, *aṅkuśa-*^{0} *yaṣṭi-*^{0}, *tomara-*^{0}, *ghaṭa-*^{0}, *ghaṭī-*^{0} and *dhanur-*^{0}.

When P gives his rules (3.2.9-15) enjoining the suffix *ac* to roots preceded by an Upapada, at the outset of the section ('*ac-prakaraṇe* '......,3.2.9.1) Kty adds a set of forms that show *ac* after √*grah-* (which root is not mentioned by P as taking *ac*) when preceded by some eight Upapada-s. These forms are: *śakti-graha-* "spear-holder", *lāṅgala-graha-* "plough-holder", *aṅkuśa-graha-* "holding the hook (meant for driving an elephant)", *yaṣṭi-graha-* "staff-bearer", *tomara-graha-* "lance-bearer", *ghaṭa-graha-* "pitcher bearer", *ghaṭī-graha-*[286] "holder of a small pitcher" and *dhanur-graha-* "holding a bow or an archer".

These forms are not found in the Veda. So it seems that their non-derivation according to the rules of P is due to their not having been developed at the time of P. Though P uses the forms, *śakti-* "lance," *yaṣṭi-* "staff (cf. 3.2.54 and *śakti-yaṣṭyor īkak*, 4.4.59) and *dhanus-* "bow" (3.2.21, 5.4.132), and though he might have known *lāṅgala–* etc. also, if at all he used them as Upapada–s with √*grah–* he might have formed the compounds (with the Vṛddhi) **śakti-grāha–* etc.[287] by means of his rule, ***karmaṇy aṇ*** (3.2.1), generally applicable to all object Upapada–s and to all roots. It is only Kty who first found in the speech of his day these compound–forms without the Vṛddhi and hence with the suffix *ac* Ptj's acceptance of them shows that he had them retained in his usage.

---

[286] The form *ghaṭī-* should be normally implied by the Paribhāṣā (*PŚ* 71), *prātipadika-grahaṇe liṅga-viśiṣṭasya=api grahaṇaṁ*. But says Kaiy (163b): *ghaṭa-grahaṇena=eva siddhe, khaṭi-grahaṇaṁ liṅgaviśiṣṭa-paribhāṣāyā anityatva-jñāpana=artham.* Next, with Ptj, this form appears again as an Upapada (II. 102.14) in the compounds, *ghaṭi-ṁ-dhama-* and *ghaṭi-ṁ-dhaya-* (Obsn **126**).

This shows a definitely new development of the forms after the time of P and their contiunity in usage till the time of Ptj.

Of these only *dhanur–graha–* is found used in literature, in *dhanurgraha–varaḥ... lakṣmaṇaḥ* (*Rām* vol.2, p.241, 995*, 1.4.[388] The rest are unattested.[289]

Obsn 68 : (i) P did not use the form *sūtra–graha–*; it is possible that he used *sūtra–grāha–*, but in what sense he did so is not known.

(ii) Kty used *sūtra–graha–* in a particular sense, and probably also *sūtra–grāha–* in some different sense.

(iii) Ptj used *sūtra–grāha–* in the sense noted by Kty; he used *sūtra–graha–* in the literal sense.

Both the Veda as well as P (8.3.90 : *sūtraṁ pratiṣṇātam*) knew the form, *sūtra–* " a string, thread ". If at all P used it as an object Upapada in composition with √*grah–*, he must have used only the form *sūtra–grāha–* (with *aṇ*) formed by his general rule, *karmaṇy aṇ* (3.2.1). But Kty used *sūtra–graha–* (with *ac*) which is not derived by P's rules.

Further, Kty's note (3.2.9.2 : *sūtre ca dhāry–arthe*) says that he used *sūtra–graha–* only in the sense of " wearer of the (sacred) thread ". This implies that he also used, in another sense (probably the same as presupposed for him but actually noted by Ptj), *sūtra–grāha–*, that is normally had by the general rule of P (3.2.1).

Ptj makes clear this another sense of *sūtra–grāha–*, viz. " one holding the thread (by the hand etc.)" (II.99.17–18). This shows that he definitly used this counter–form, beside the restricted *sūtra–graha–* of Kty to which he takes no objection.

In literature, it is only *sūtra–grāhaka–* (parallel in sense to *sūtra–grāha–* of Ptj " the holder of reins " that is attested (*KauArth* 2.30.26, 2.30.44).

---

[287] The *MBhr* actually does use the form *dhanur-grāha-* in the agent sense thrice (3.37.18, 3.225.30, 17.2.22).

[288] The *MBhr* shows *dhanur-graha-* (12.203.19) too in the action sence, but only *dhanur-grāha-* in the agent sense.

[289] The forms, *aṅkuśa-graha-* (63.11) and *tomara-graha-* (35.30, 63.11-12), are found used in *Divy*, but in the action sense.

Obsn : 69 (i) P used the forms *stambe-rama-* and *karṇe-japa-*, either (1) as non–names (in the literal or etymological sense) and as names, or (2) only as non–names.

(ii) Kty any Ptj used these only as names, and other expressions in the etymological sense.

P seems to have had in his usage the Upapada–compound forms not attested in the Veda), *stambe-rama-*" delighting in the clumps of high grass" and *karṇe-japa-* " whispering in the ear ", ending in *ac* (derived by *stamba-karṇayo*[290] *rami-japoḥ* 3.2.13; and, being *aluk* compounds, (a) if names, by *haladantāt saptamyāḥ saṁjñāyām* 6.3.9, or (b) if non–names, by *tatpuruṣe kṛti bahulam* 6.3.14). The Sūtra in hand (3 2.13), however, provides no indication that the forms intended to be derived by P were *aluk* compounds : as it is, the Sūtra should be deriving only the forms, **stamba-rama* and– *karṇa-japa-* !

Kty continued to have P's very forms in his usage, though only in the restricted senses of " an elephant" and " a tale–bearer or an informer " respectively; so he added a modificatory note (3.2.13.1 : *stamba-karṇayor hasti-sūcakayoḥ*) to the rule of P. The fact that Kty uses those forms in the stated senses that give them the status of a name, and that as names they are attested in *M* and in later literature only as *aluk* compound forms (viz. *stambe-rama-* and *karṇe-japa-*), suggest that it is these forms to which he intended to refer. Further, the fact that he does not suggest a form–change in his usage from that of P, but only a semantic change, also indicates that the forms in the usage of P also were the same ones (showing the *aluk* compounds), though he forgot to state their (*aluk*) nature : being not restricted in their significance, they could be names (derived by 6.3.9) **as well** as non–names (derived by 6.3.14), or they could be non–names **only** (6.3.14).[291] — In the possibility of Kty suggesting for his usage the from–change (with *aluk*) as well as the semantic change, he would certainly have framed his Vt as '*stamba-karṇayor hasti-sūcakayor aluk*' referring to both these points : only then it could be held that he supposed for P's usage the forms, **stamba-rama-* and *karṇa-japa-*. This interpretation can also be supported by the fact that **stamba-rama-* and *karṇa-japa-* are not attested in literature except late in *KathāS* (60.54)[292] showing only the latter form.

Kty's note also suggests that in other senses he used other forms in place of these and ending in suffixes other than *ac*. Those other forms of Kty were probably — as recorded by Ptj II.92.22 — the uncompounded expressions, *stambe rantā* and *karṇe japitā,* with the roots ending in the suffix *tṛc* and the sense being only etymological viz. " delighting in the clumps of high grass " and " whispering in the ear " respectively. — That Ptj, further, not only retained Kty's usage (though having used the forms only twice in *M*) but added the concrete instance of an alternative situation, suggests that he faithfully represented not only the main usage of Kty (noted in his Vt) but possibly his alternative usage as well (not noted in the Vt) that was handed down to him by unbroken tradition.

---

[290] Where *stamba-* and *karṇa-* are not the Karmopapada-s but Subantopapada-s; see *KV* (172) : *ramer akarmakatvāj japeḥ śabdakarmakatvāt karma na saṁbhavati=iti 'supi'=ity etad ihābhisaṁbadhyate.*

[291] There is also a remote and theoretical possibility of their being names that were different from those at Kty's times.

[292] According to *PW* 5.1258.

The forms do not seem to occur in the early Sanskrit literature. *stambe-rama-* is seen in *Raghu* (5.72) *Bālarāmāyaṇa* 140,17 (V.66c)[293] etc. *karṇe-japa-* also appears in classical Sanskrit.

Obsn 70 : (i) It cannot be said whether either P or Kty used the proper noun *śaṁ-vada-*.

(ii) Ptj had it in his usage.

P lays down a general rule (*śami dhātoḥ saṁjñāyām,* 3.2.14) enjoining *ac* after all types of roots when they are preceded in composition by the Upapada '*śam-*' " auspiciously "[294] and when the whole form becomes a proper name (Saṁjñā). From this it cannot be known what particular forms beginning with *śam-* were used by P. Kty's discussion-note (3.2.14,1) too does not mention any particular form. It is only Ptj who illustrates the line of argument with the form *śaṁ-vada-* (that was a proper noun with him) literally meaning " speaking auspiciously or well. "[295]

In the absene of the evidence of usage, it cannot be said whether the form reflects any historical development at any time from P to Ptj, or whether it shows an unbroken line of usage.

The form is not attested in literature.

Obsn 71 : (i) It cannot be said whether either P or Kty knew the proper noun *śaṁ-bhava-*.

(ii) Ptj used it.

The same rule of P (3.2.14) and the same note of Kty (3.2.14.1) are further illustrated by Ptj with the proper noun form, *śaṁ-bhava-,* meaning literally "being or existing for welfare " and known to be a name of Śiva.

---

[293] According to the Calcutta edition : V. 68c (p. 286).

[294] Listed in the *'svar-ādi'-gaṇa* of indeclinables that is referred to at 1.1.37.

[295] This appears to be a case of what is later called a *'Yoga-rūḍha'* form carrying the *'Yoga-rūḍhi'* or etymological-cum-conventional primary meaning. See the *Rasa-gaṅgādhara* (p. 148) : *seyam abhidhā trividhā* etc.

The form occurs in the expression, *námaḥ śaṁbhavā́ya ca mayobhavā́ya ca ……,* in *VS* (16.41, p.506). The text of *VS* was not only anterior to Kty but to P as well.[296] But as P is generally known **not** to be drowing upon the linguistic facts of the White *YV*,[297] although *śaṁ-bhava-* found in *VS* is derivable by the present rule of P, it cannot be said definitely that he knew the form. In the same way it may be doubted if the 'southerner' Kty knew the eastern *VS* text and our form occurring in it;[298] but that has not yet been established.

Under these circumstances, on this form too no definite statement of a historical nature can be made, besides only that it had a place in the usage of Ptj.

The form is not attested in Classical Sanskrit.

Obsn 72 : (i) P may or may not have had the form *śaṁ-karā-* (with *ac*) as a proper noun with its etymological (i.e. habit-) sense strongly felt in the usage. Similarly, it cannot be said if he used the form *śaṁ-karī-* (with *ṭa*) as a mere adjective (in the etymological sense).

(ii) Kty appears to have used *śaṁ-karā-* in the two senses; but it is uncertain if even he used the adjective *śaṁ-karī-*.

(iii) Kuṇaravāḍava saw *śaṁ-karā-* in his usage, but he looked at it probably as a corruption of an older form *śaṁ-garā-*; of his use of the adjective *śaṁ-karī-*, also, anything definite cannot be said.

(iv) Ptj used *śaṁ-karā-* exactly as Kty did.

---

[296] See THIEME: "It may be shown in many ways that Pāṇini's grammar is younger than the VS. and ŚBr." (*P&V* 74-75).

[297] Cf. GOLDSTÜCKER, *Pāṇini, his place in Sanskrit literature*, 99ff. See further THIEME: "We cannot help but arrive at the conclusion that Pāṇini did not draw upon the White YV. Goldstücker was right here." (op. cit., 74.) For an answer to the question, why Pāṇini did not know the White YV., or, to put it more accurately, why he did not exploit its grammatical facts, we apparently have to look in a different direction. It seems to have to do not with chronology, but with geography. Already Weber (Indische Studien, 5.50) has considered the possibility that Pāṇini might not have known the VS. and ŚBr. for the simple reason that 'they belong explicitly to the country of the Videhas, one of the most eastern districts of India.' He thought it 'not impossible that the different districts of India possessed different Yajus texts.' ….. Weber's happy suggestion ….." (p. 75.) "Pāṇini's manner of quoting the Easterners confirms then, on the whole, the traditional assumption, which is borne out by his relation to the northern vedic schools, that he was a northern grammarian." (p. 79.) For an earlier view, see K. B. PATHAK, "Were the Vājasaneyī Saṁhitā and the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa Unknown to Pāṇini ?", *ABORI* (1930) 11.84-89.

[298] Later it will be found that a form *giri-śaya-* from *VS* was, however, known to Kty. See Obsn **77**.

When P lays down the general rule (3.2.14) enjoining *ac* " after any root " (' *dhātoḥ* ') when preceded in composition by *śam*– in a resultant proper-noun form, Kty (3.2.14 1 : *śami saṁjñāyāṁ dhātugrahaṇaṁ kṛño hetvādiṣu ṭa–pratiṣedhārtham*) discusses the propriety of the word ' *dhātoḥ* ' in P's rule. Ptj accepts the argument[299] of Kty and refers to the fem. form *śaṁ-karā*– (ending in *ac* and *ṭāp*) intended by Kty. This form is used by Ptj in two contexts : once, (1) when it is the name of a female ascetic, at the same time connoting the quality of being habitually beneficent[300] (*śaṁkarā nāma parivrājikā......... tacchīlā ca* II.100.6), and secondly, (2) when it is the name[301] of a female fortune–teller,[302] at the same time reflecting the quality of being habitually beneficent (*śaṁkarā* (*nāma*) *śakunikā tacchīlā ca*, loc. cit.).

What is thus understood (see fn. 299) may or may not have been intended by P; so it is not certain whether P had in his usage the form *śaṁ-karā*– that is sought to be established by the interpretation of Kty and Ptj in the two senses and that is not attested in literature. But there is at least a strong suggestion that Kty used the form as the proper noun of some type of a woman, with the primary or etymological sense of " being habitually a well-doer " still transparent in it.[303] (Logically, there is also a secondary implication that when not a Saṁjñā but just an adjective in the Tācchīlya (3.2.20) sense, the form *śaṁkarī- "(a woman) habitually doing good (to others)" was used by P and Kty.[304]) Ptj only further supplies the context from his usage which named a female ascetic or a female fortune-teller like that (i.e. śaṁkarā-).

---

[299] Viz. where there is equal possibility (*ubhayaṁ prāpnoti* II. 100.7) of the occurrence (Avakāśa) of both *ac* and ṭa (— i.e. in a Saṁjñā-word which at the same time denotes an agent with some general nature or habit, and which contains the Upapada *śam* and the root √*kṛ*- —),
even though the *ṭa* (following √*kṛ*- and giving a form denoting the agent's habit etc.) is more powerful being enjoined by *P* in a rule (3.2.20) that is subsequent (*para*) to the present one (3.2.14) enjoining *ac*,
it is intended (on the strength of the use by P of the word *'dhātoḥ'* "after a **(i.e. any) root"** — *dhātu-grahaṇa-sāmarthyāt* II. 100.7 — at 3.2.14 giving a name-form) :
to rule out after √*kṛ*- the possibility of getting the suffix *ṭa* Aand the suffix *ṅīp* in the fem. that then comes as a rule after *ṭ-it* suffixes by 4.1.15), and get the suffix *ac* (and *ṭāp* in the fem. by 4.1.4).

[300] Although *'tacchīlā ca'* is not mentioned here (i.e. after .... *parivrājikā*), still, being placed at the end of the two phrases here, it is to be understood according to the usual style of Sanskrit to be present at the end of both the phrases. See also Mss. D, E reading *śaṁkarā nāma parivrājikā tacchīlā ca.*

[301] Although *'nāma'* is not found printed in KIELHORN's edition between *'śaṁkarā'* and *'śakunikā'*, the context (which, in both the *śaṁkarā* forms, refers simultaneoulsy to a proper noun as well as to an adjective) is strongly in favour of its presence there. The Banaras Edition actually does show it (— vide fn. in the 3rd ed. of *M*, 1965).

[302] Curiously enough, in early Sanskrit, *śakunikā*- is found to occur in *MBhr* only as denoting a female bird and as the name of one of the Mātṛ-s attendant on Skanda. In the sence of a female bird the form *śakuni*- is found to occur in Ptj's usage (cf. *śaśaghnī śakuniḥ* II. 104.15), for which see Obsn **116.**

[303] See fn. 295 on Obsn **70.**

Mention is made here by Ptj of one Ku(ṇaravāḍava) who seeks to correct (or perhaps, to correctly derive) the form śaṁ-karā-, which according to him was really śaṁ-garā- "uttering a benediction", and which showed at its basis the root √gṝ- "to utter a sound" and not the root √kṛ- "to do or cause". From the way he records his dissent as quoted by Ptj[305], it appears

(1) that he too had noted śaṁ-karā- in the usage;

(2) that śaṁ-karā-, according to him, was 'wrong' for śaṁ-garā-, the name of a woman;

(3) that the reason for this view of his was that "uttering" a blessing was the prime quality that gave name to some type of woman (who were — 'wrongly' — called śaṁ-karā-);

(4) that, therefore, in his usage there was no possibility (as the one visualised by Kty and Ptj) of the simultaneous occurrence of *ac* and *ṭa* after √kṛ- prefixed by śam-, (probably implying thereby that his usage had only the habit-form resulting from śam- and √kṛ-, which was *śaṁ-karī-, with *ṭa* from 3.2.20 followed by *ṅīp*); and

(5) that, possibly according to him, the purpose of using the word '*dhātoḥ*' in the Sūtra was not what was supposed to be.[306] (—What else it could be according to him we do not know.)

The linguistic value of Ku's note, having as its basis the form śaṁ-karā- (meant by Kty), is obvious though pointing in different and interesting directions. The variation noted was, as probably supposed by Ku, a phonetic confusion between his "correct" form śaṁ-garā- and Kty's "incorrect" form śaṁ-karā-, leading to a morphological confusion of seeing at the base there the root *kṛ-* instead of the root *gṝ-*. And this seems to point to the following **four possibilities.**

(I. Ku being taken much earlier than Ptj:)

1. A historical development from the pre-Kty śaṁ-garā- to Kty's śaṁ-karā-, reflecting a phonetic change of the devoicing of the earlier *-g-* to the new *-k-*, leading (— the society being forgetful and unconscious of the

---

[304] Till now the form is not attested in early Sanskrit literature. It is only in the later Kāvya and Kośa literatures that it occurs in the senses of (i) the name of Śiva's wife, (ii) the name of the plant Mañjiṣṭhā, and (iii) the name of the plant Śamī.

[305] "*naiṣā śaṁkarā / śaṁgaraiṣā / gṛṇātiḥ śabdakarmā, tasyaiṣa prayogaḥ /*" II. 100..8-9.

[306] Kaiy (164 a) explains : *pṛṣodarāditvāt saṁjñāyāṁ gakārasya kakāra-vyatyayena śaṁkarā-śabdasya siddhatvāt, tadarthaṁ dhātu-grahaṇaṁ na kartavyam, ity arthaḥ /*

change —) to a morphological confusion and a false etymology (from √*kṛ*- instead of from √*gṝ*-). This would make Ku an unacquainted contemporary or a close successor of Kty[307] to be able to take note of the historical development.

2. A regional peculiarity of Kty and Ku each that would make Kty (with his *śaṁ-karā*-) almost a contemporary of Ku (with his *śaṁ-garā*-) without knowing him separated by long distance.

(II. Ku being taken somewhat contmporaneous with Ptj :)

3. A historical development from pre-Ptj *śaṁ-garā*- to Ptj's *śaṁ-karā*-, being noted by Ku.
4. A regional peculiarity of Ku and Ptj each.[308]

Of these, the **third** one appears more probable than the other ones as it seems to suggest Ku's familiarity not simply with Kty's bare form but with Ptj's connected usage that is quoted; for Ku's "*eṣa prayogaḥ*" probably has a reference to that same connected usage.

In literature, the two forms are not found attested.

Obsn 73 : (i) P used compound-forms with *śaya*- prefixed by locative words (possibly including *pārśva*-, *pṛṣṭha*- and *udara*-).

(ii) Kty and Ptj used this form-type as well as similar compounds showing *pārśva*-, *pṛṣṭha*- and *udara*- in the non-locative sense.

P had forms derived with *ac* from √*śī*- prefixed by a word (Upapada) denoting location (showing the locative case); so he framed a rule (3.2.15 : *adhikaraṇe śeteḥ*) to establish those. But Kty (3.2.15 1 : ...... *pārśvādiṣu=upasaṁkhyānam*) saw in his usage (not only such but) additional forms showing *ac* after √*śī*- that was prefixed by words (not strictly locative but) " like *pārśva*- "; i.e. he had forms ' like *pārśva-śaya*- (explainable with the instrumental case as *pārśvādhyāṁ śete iti*) " lying or sleeping on (one of) the two sides ". What other forms were meant by Kty we do not know for certain. But although "*pārśvādi*" is not a Gaṇa from *GP*, Ptj explains it to be a group of three and refer (only once in *M*) to the following three compound forms from his usage : *pārśva-śaya*-, *pṛṣṭha-śaya*- " lying or sleeping on the back "and *udara-śaya*- " lying or sleeping on the belly ". (*pṛṣṭha*- and *udara*- are found used by Kty respectively at 4.2.42.1 and 6.2.108.1.)

---

[307] "Later than Kâtyâyana", according to KIELHORN, *IA* (1887) 16.105.

[308] Ku is once again referred to and quoted by Ptj at III. 317.9-10 (on 7.3.1.6), also as correcting Kty's etymology (—*vaihīnari*- being derived by Ku from *vihīnanara*- through *vihīnara*-, and from *vahīnara*- through *vihīnara*- like Kty). There, however, the principle detected by Ku was that of syncopation, as against that of devoicing here.

Now, *pārśva-*, *pṛṣṭha-* and *udara-* are known to the Veda; and the first two are also used by P (cf. 5.2.75, 6 2.114, 8.3.53). Hence it is likely that they appeared as Upapada-s compounded with √*śī-* and denoted only anything else than location in the speech of P. Thus, absence of a rule of P establishing these compound-forms, and Kty's supplementary rule seeking to do that, probably shows no distinct development of historical value in the usage of the times but merely difference in the manner of dissolving the compounds.

The forms do not seem to occur in literature.

Obsn 74 : (i) P did not know the form *digdha- saha-śaya-*.
(ii) Kty had it in his usage.
(iii) Ptj perhaps continued the usage of Kty.

Probably in continuation of his rule (3.2.15.1) relating to the Karaṇopapada-s (supplementing P's mention limited to the Adhikaraṇopapada-s) being prefixed to √*śī-* followed by *ac*, Kty (3.2.15.2 : *digdhasaha-pūrvāc ca*) adds the combined form *digdha-saha-*,[309] (also showing, according to *KV* 172, the instrumental case within it : *digdhena saha*), to be prefixed to √*śī-* + *ac*. The resultant form, *digdha-saha-śaya-* " lying along with a soiled object or person ", besides Ptj's **bare** record of it, is however nowhere attested in literature, Vedic or classical. Further, for what of an elaborate **phrase** (containing the form) in the illustration of Ptj, we cannot be sure even of Ptj to have retained this rare and peculiar form in his usage.

Obsn 75 : (i) P did not use the form *uttāna-śaya-* in which the Upapada denoted the agent.
(ii) Kty and Ptj had it in their usages.

On P's rule (3.2.15) about √*śī-* taking *ac* when prefixed by an Upapada in the locative sense, Kty (3.2.15.3: *uttānādiṣu kartṛṣu*) adds a group of forms wherein the Upapada-s " like *uttāna-* "[310] had reference to the agent. Ptj records only two compound forms in explanation of Kty's note, of which the first is *uttāna-śaya-* " lying or sleeping having stretched out (oneself), i.e.

---

[309] Which is not met as an independent form. (See Kaiy 164b : *digdhasaha-śabdasya samudāyasya pūrvatvam āśrīyate, na tu pratyekam;* and NBh l.c. — *digdhasaha-pūrvatā prāyogigī bodhyā, pṛthak digdhasaha-śabdasya siddhyabhāvāt.*) The irregular compounding *digdhasaha-śaya-* is done by Kaiy l.c. and *PdM* 553 by the rule, *mayūravyaṁsakādayaś ca* (2.1.72). See *KV* (98) there : *avihita-lakṣaṇas tatpurṣo mayūravyaṁsakādiṣu draṣṭavyaḥ.*

[310] These Upapada-s at the time of Kty were probably more than two (cp. the plural *uttānādiṣu*), though Ptj has supplied only two. There is also no *uttānādi-gaṇa* mentioned in *GP*.

on the back or supinely or with the face upwards." This shows that Ptj too had it in his usage.

Probably, one of the earliest occurrences of the form is to be seen in *YCampū* (I.232.6) of Somadeva-Sūri.

Obsn 76 : (i) P did not use the form *avamūrdha-śaya-*.
(ii) Kty might have used it.
(iii) Ptj did use it.

The second of the two forms recorded by Ptj, in explanation of the agent Upapada-s "like *uttāna-*" from Kty's note (3.2.15.3) that was to be prefixed to √śī- + *ac*, is *avamūrdha-*[311]; and the final form was *avamūrdha-śaya-* "lying with the head hanging down". This form is not attested in literature, although *avamūrdhaka-* (and not *avamūrdha-*) "having the head hanging down" occurs twice in *Divy* (6.6; 439.29).

Obsn 77 : (i) It cannot be said how P derived the Vedic form *giriśa-* which he must have known. Possibly he had *giri-śaya-* in his usage.
(ii) Kty noted the Vedic occurrence of *giriśa-*, though he did not find it in the secular usage. Possibly he had *giri-śaya-* in his usage.
(iii) Ptj's usage was probably the same as Kty's.

P had laid down (3.2.15) that √śī- when in composition with a locative Upapada took the suffix *ac*. Kty then noted the form *giriśa-* as occurring in the Veda (probably in the well-known line, *śivéna vácasā*[312] *tvā gíriśāchā*[313] *vadāmasi*, *VS* 16.4 (p.490), *TS* 4.5.1.2, *MS* 2.9.2, *VS* (*K*) 17.14, where it is a name of the god Śiva). Understanding the form to mean "one who lies on a mountain", he analysed it into a locative Upapada *giri-* and the root √śī-, but found that as a primary form it could **not** be derived with the the suffix *ac*, i.e. by the present rule of P. — So he instead suggested (3.2.15.4 : *girau ḍaś*[314] *chandasi*) to derive it with another suffix of P[315], *ḍa*[316]. He, of course, took care to note the usage as being restricted to the Veda. That suggests that he did not have it in the usage of his time when it must have been looked upon as an archaic form.[317] Stray uses of the form are, however, found in literature, as in

---

[311] *Pdm* 553 : *avanato mūrddhā yasya avamūrddhā adhomukhaḥ*.

[312] *MS* reads *vávasá*.

[313] To be read as *acchā*.

[314] It appears RENOU has read here '*ḍac*' instead, and hence has also the suffix as '*ḍac*', which is not supported by the MSS. material. (See *La grammaire de Pāṇini*, 2nd ed., 1966, I. 183.)

[315] Elsewhere used at 3.2.48-50, 97-101.

[316] Causing the *ṭi-lopa* by 6.4.143.

[317] Cp. Kaiy (164b) : *'Chandasi'=iti vacanād bhāṣāyāṁ 'giriśa'-śabdasyāsādhutvam āhuḥ*.

MBhr (3.40.55, 5.49.24, with *giriśa*– as the v.l. in both, which latter also in *Kumāra* 5.3) and later in *Kumāra* (1.37,60) and *Raghu* (2.41). That means, although acceptedly archaic and peculiar to the Veda, the form was sometimes carried into the secular usage also;[318] Kty, however, was **not aware** of such a usage (in *MBhr*).

For some reason or the other, Kty got in two minds and thought out an alternative suggestion (3.2.15.5 : *taddhito vā*) which sought to derive *giriśa*– as a secondary form. This could take away the reflection of neglect of the well-known Vedic form cast upon P by Kty's earlier suggestion; for now one or the other of P's rules on the secondary formation could easily derive the form.[319] — Be that as it may. Whichever Taddhita–rule of P might be taken to establish our form, it is known to be freely deriving forms from the Vedic as well as the secular language. It is nevertheless certain, that Kty's alternative suggestion, seeking to derive the form with a secondary suffix, also, like his first suggestion, related to the same **Vedic** form *giriśa*–. The context of the previous Vt (4) of Kty is too strong a factor to allow a different supposition. That means, the *giriśa*– in the mind of Kty in this Vt (*taddhito vā*) was **not** common to the Vedic and the secular languages, **although** the Taddhita– rules in question were applicable commonly to both. Kty did **not** know the the secular usage of *giriśa*–. (See fn. 317.)

Now what could be the usage known to P ? To say that he did not know or derive *giriśa*– (that was peculiar to the Veda), fits in with the theory that he did not, for his analysis, utilise the linguistic material of the eastern text of *VS*.[320] But what of the other Saṁhitā–s (quoted above) that show the same text ? And, can we even be certain that he did not derive the form *giriśa*- ?

---

[318] Cp. the remarks of Cāritravardhana on *Raghu* 2.41 (quoted with printing mistakes by G. R. NANDARGIKAR in his third ed. of *Raghu*, Bombay, 1897, Notes, p. 35) and Mallinātha (*bhāṣāyām api kvacid iṣyate*) on *Kumāra* 1.37.

[319] The text of Ptj's gloss here (*girau śete giriśa iti*, II.100.21), which appears to be the same as was read by Kaiy, seems to have been very early tampered with; for, it created difficulties to the early students of *M*, as to which Taddhita-suffix was stated by Ptj as being intended by Kty. The hard attempts of different commentators to explain the derivation of the form in their own way are echoed by Bhartṛhari, *Vākyapadīya*, 2.171 :

vaira-vāsiṣṭha-giriśās tathaikāgārikādayaḥ /
kaiścit kathaṁcit vyākhyātā nimittāvadhisaṁkaraiḥ //

and in (his Svopajña ?) *Vṛtti* on the text at 1.24-26 for which see the ed. of Kāṇḍa I by K. A. Subramonia IYER (Poona, 1966), p. 78. Direct records of the derivations are supplied by Kaiy, 164 b, (on the secondary formation only), Puṇyarāja (c. 12th cent. A.D.) on 2.171 above (on the primary formation only : . 150 of ed. by G. MĀNAVALLĪ) and Cāritravardhana (before 1385 A.D. : op. cit., ntroduction, p. 18) on *Raghu* 2.41), (on the primary as well as the secondary rmations).

fn. 297 on Obsn **71**,

There can be the following answers :

(1) Theoretically he could be said be to be deriving it as a primary form, from *giri-* as the object Upapada, √*śo-* and the suffix *ka* (by 3. 2. 3, as first suggested by Puṇyarāja : fn. 319 above); for he knew √*śo-* which he has even used thrice in his rules (2. 4. 78, 7.3.37, 7.4.41). With this derivation, however, the form as applied to Śiva yields a sense that is not happy : " one who (with his use of it) reduces or shortens the (Himālaya) mountain ".

(2) Theoretically he could also be said to be deriving it (by 5.2. 100 etc.) as a secondary form : here too the sense resulting is not happy (viz. " (Śiva) who owns a moumtain ").

(3) It is not impossible that he saw it as only a metrical shortening of (the compound-form) *girīśa-* " the lord of the mountain (Himālaya) ", as that is a phenomenon to be commonly met with in the Veda. This gives a better sense than that given by either of the two derivations above. As thus referring to Śiva, *girīśa-* occurs in the vll. in *MBhr*; the lexicons also relate it to Mt Himālaya (as being " the lord of mountains ") or to Bṛhaspati (" the Lord of Speech " from *gir-* and *īśa-*).

Under these circumstances, it is not possible to be definite as to how P looked at it.

At the same time, the assumption of *giriśa-* being a metrical alternant of the original *girīśa-* appears so happy, that it need not be discarded because another form *giri-śaya-* is found to occur in the Veda (- though only once, in *VS* itself : *nâmo giriśayā́ya ca* (16.29), p. 501-), which also refers to god Śiva and is at the same time derivable (commonly for the Veda and for the secular language) by the very present rule of P, showing the locative Upapada *giri-*, √*śī-* and the suffix *ac* and showing the same sense of " one who lies on the mountain ". Possibly it was this form, *giri-śaya-*, which he must have noted,[321] that influenced Kty to see the same sense and then the same elements (viz. the locative Upapada *giri-* and √*śī-*) in the form *giriśa-* occurring in the same Vedic text. He did not record the Vedic *giri-śaya-* also, possibly because it was in his time not peculiar to the Veda but common to the secular usage also. In other words, he saw the suffix *ḍa* in the form *giriśa-*

---

[321] About the compact nature of at least the first 18 sections of *VS* in respect of their time of composition, see WINTERNITZ, *A History of Indian Literature*, Vol. I (1927), p. 172.

used only in the Veda, but the suffix *ac* in *giri-śaya-* both in the Veda as well as in the secular usage. [322]

As for Ptj, his all too brief and non-committal attitude noway helps us to have a glimpse in his usage. It is possible that like Kty he too did not use *giriśa-* but *giriśaya-*.

Addenda to << 3 >>
(Formations by the Sūtra 3. 1. 134.)

Obsn 78 : P, Kty and Ptj, all, used the form *ajara-*.

P, (*ajaryaṁ saṁgatam*, 3.1.105) cites the form *ajarya-* "undying, long lasting" (with the Kṛtya suffix *yat* after √*jṝ-*) in the agent sense, whose use is conditioned by an appositional construction with *saṁgata-* "companionship, friendship", As a counter-example to this, Ptj gives the form *ajara-* (with the suffix *ac* after √*jṛ-*), also in the agent sense, that is not so conditioned. He also gives the following as one of the possible constructions with it : *ajaraḥ kambalaḥ* (II.83.9), where *ajara-* (like *ajarya-*) means "not wearing off, long-lasting".

The form *ajara-* is derived even by P by means of his rule, *naño jara-mara-mitra-mṛtāḥ* (6.2.116). It is found in *Raghu* (10.19), and earlier *Manu* (2 148) notes it in the compound *ajara=amara-*. So it is obvious that Kty was familiar with it.

Thus the form shows a continuity in the usage from P upto Ptj.

Obsn 79 : (i) P used *deva-* (as a Taddhita ?), and probably *meṣa-* (as an un-analysable form ?). It is not certain if he knew *seva-*.
(ii) Kty's predecessoor or contemporary used the form *meṣa-* (and possibly *deva-* and *seva-* also)-
(iii) Kty retained that usage.
(iv) Ptj used all the three forms.

---

[322] This is according to the first of the following three possible interpretations of Vt, which shows only the word *'chandasi'* of a limitative (*niyāmaka*) nature :—

INTERPRETATION		CAN IT DERIVE THESE FORMS ?	
		Vedic	Secular
(1) *girau ḍaḥ chandasi eva*	(*ḍa*:)	*giriśa-* : Yes.	*giriśa-* (*MBhr*) : No.
	(*ac*:)	*giriśaya-* (*VS*) : Possibly.	*giriśaya-* : Possibly.
(2) *girau ḍaḥ eva chandasi*	(*ḍa*:)	*giriśa-* : Yes.	*giriśa-* (*MBhr*) : Possibly.
	(*ac*:)	*giriśaya-* (*VS*) : No.	*giriśaya-* : Possibly.
(3) *girau ḍaḥ eva chandasi eva*	(*ḍa*:)	*giriśa-* : Yes.	*giriśa-* (*MBhr*) : No.
	(*ac*:)	*giriśaya-* (*VS*) : No.	*giriśaya-* : No.

P (3.1 135 : *igupadha-jñā-prī-kiraḥ kaḥ*) lays down that roots having ***i, u*** or *ṛ*(short or long) as their penultimate take the suffix *ka* in their primary formations; this suffix rules out the operation of Guṇa, by the rule *kṅiti ca* (1.1.5). But Kty records a Pūrvapn view (3.1 135.1 : *ig–upadhebhya 'upasarge' ka-vidhir, meṣādyarthaḥ* [323], that this rule of P should have its application restricted to such *ig–upadha* roots 'as have an Upasarga as the Upapada', and not have it extended to bare roots when the suffix ought to be only *ac* (for which Guṇa is not forbidden) as in the examples, *meṣa–* "one who blinks (so: a ram ?)" (from √*miṣ–* "to blink" [324]) 'and the like.'——What these other forms 'like *meṣa–*' **as intended by the objector** were, we do not know for certain. There is even no '*meṣādi*'*–gaṇa* to be found in *GP*. However, on the authority of Ptj who explains the '*ādi*' here, they were: *deva–* "who shines (so: a god)" (from √*div–* "to shine") and *seva–* " a sewer or stitcher" (from √*siv–* "to sew or stitch"). Hence it can be said that *meṣa–* was certainly, and *deva–* and *seva–* were possibly, intended according to this school of thought. The forms *miṣa–, diva–* and *siva–* showing *ka* were not found in its usage. ——But the Pūrvapn can be further said to have a positive implication as well, that when roots at the base of even these forms were preceded by an Upasarga they could or did (?) take the suffix *ka.* (E. g. *nimiṣa–* etc. of the Epics ?) ——But then what of the *ac* in *nimeṣá–* from the Veda (*TS* 7.5 25.1, *TBr* 2.1.5.9) and *MBhr* (14.45.4) and *unmeṣa–* from the Epics (*MBhr* l.c., *Rām* 6.105.22)?——We possess, however, no explicit evidence of the usages [325] that might have been implied.

Before going to Kty's criticism on this, it may be noted here that, of the three forms, *meṣa–* and *deva–* occur in the Veda. Further, √*miṣ–* is found in *RV*, and, although √*div–* "to shine" is not attested in the Veda, that root (and not √*dev–* or *devṛ devane, DhP* 500) is obviously at the basis of the

---

[323] "So as to have **(ruled out)** forms like *meṣa-* (from the scope of the *ka-vidhi*)". It is to be noted that the Pūrvapn, in order to prove his thesis convincingly, illustrates it rightly by drawing **negative** examples*, i.e. those ('like *meṣa-*') that are marked (1) by an **absence** of the Upasarga in them and, at the some time, (2) by an **absence** of the suffix *ka* (but presence of the suffix *ac*) in them. He then postulates a concomitance between the two conditions, and presents that to us as his generalisation. (—* For this style with Kty, cp. 2.4.54.4-8 at *M* I. 487.)
This would be a better way of understandting the import of this word than merely as "in order to justify (or establish) forms like *meṣa-*."

[324] Cp. *Nir* 3.16 : *meṣo miṣateḥ. miṣaty asau meṣaḥ* at *KV* 3.3.19 is translated by Vasu (*Aṣṭādhyāyī* I, p. 492) as "a sheep, lit. that which looks helplessly." But *Ny* there (III. 25) supplies *miṣa spardhāyām,* identifying the root to be from the sixth conjugation (*DhP* 1353), the form then meaning "one who contends or struggles"!

[325] Possibly : *vikṣipa-* and *vilikha-* (Obsn **86**).

Vedic *deva-*[326] (unless again the noun *div-* "heaven" were supposed to be at its basis[327]). (*miṣa-* occurs at *KathāS* 64.125 (:*PW* 5.788), and *diva-* at *MBhr* 3.158.8, 14.28.10.) The root √*siv-* also is found in *RV*. In P, *deva-* is of frequent occurrence, and √*siv-* "to sew" (*ṣivu tantu-santāne, DhP* 1108) too is used thrice (8.3.70,71,116). —— From this, P can be said to be deriving (with *ac*) *deva-* from √*div-* and *meṣa-* from √*miṣ-*, and perhaps (but not necessarily) *seva-* from √*siv-*.

To say that P knew these three *ac*-ending forms, they ought to have secured a place (- in his time-) in the *pacādi-gaṇa* referred to by him at 3. 1. 134 as showing *ac*-ending forms in it; for, these three forms derived from *ig-upadha* roots show an exception to his next rule (135) by which the *ig-upadha* roots take only *ka* after them. That the forms did not show themselves in the *pacādi-gaṇa* to Ptj is known from the difficulty that still persisted about them to him and from the way he tries to resolve it : *kathaṁ meṣaḥ devaḥ seva iti ? pacādiṣu pāṭhaḥ ' kariṣyate '*. (II. 92.3). So it can be regarded that the *pacādi-gaṇa* at the time of P perhaps included even all these three forms, and that later, on being somehow lost from the Gaṇa, they were reinstated in it by Ptj. Or, it is also likely that he included only *seva-* in the *pacādi-gaṇa* and took *deva-* as a Taddhita and *meṣa-* as an un-analysable form.

Now, Kty (3. 1. 135.3 : *na vā, budhādīnāṁ darśanād anupasarge ' pi*) rejects the correction sought to be made above to the rule of P, by producing **other** contrary examples of his own. Yet he does not take exception to the usage **already referred to** (explicitly and implicitly) by the objector (viz. *meṣa-*, *deva-* and *seva-*, and perhaps *nimiṣa-* etc); on the other hand, he says that his finding the contrary examples is ' in addition ' (*api*) (to the objector's examples). That means that means that he retains the use of *ac* so far as these forms are concerned. —Ptj's " Vyākhyāna " (probably based on Tradition), amplifying the Vt, gives us for the first time only the two forms beyond *meṣa-* (viz. *deva-* and *seva-*) as being intended by the Pūrvapn and by Kty. Anyway, that makes certain that Ptj had in his own usage all the three. The form *seva-*, however, is not attested in literature.

Now it cannot be definitely stated whether the prima facie view recorded by Kty came from a scholar who was anterior to him or contemporary with him. In other words, we do not know whether the currency of the three forms, in the usages of the Purvapn on the one hand and Kty on the other, spread over two points of time or over two localities at the same period.

---

[326] So Yāska)on *RV* 1.1 : *devo (dānād vā, dīpanād vā,) dyotanād vā* (*Nir* 7.15). See also Kullūka at *Manu* 12.117 : *dyotanād 'devaḥ'* and 8.92 : *devanād devaḥ;* but BhD has *devī dīvyateḥ* (*SK* p. 488). See also WHITNEY's criticism (*AmJPh* 5.291).

[327] Cp. Yāska (l.c.) : *devo .... dyu-sthāno bhavati=iti vā.* Also *PW*, 3.736:1) adj.... *himmlisch, gottlich,* 2) m.*der Himmlische, Gott.*

Obsn 120 : (This may be referred to here for the forms, *kiṁ-karā-*, *yat-karā-*, *tat-kārā-* and *bahu-karā-*.)

Obsn 95 : (This may be referred to here for the form, *tana-*.)

<< 4 >> FORMS IN -A_2 (*KA*)

(Sūtras : 3. 1. 135 f., 144, 3.2. 3-7, 77)

Obsn 80 : (i) P may have used the forms *budha-*, *bhida-*, *yudha-* and *siva-*.

(ii) Kty's predecessor or contemporary probably did not have them in his usage.

(iii) Kty and Ptj had them in their usage.

When the Pūrvapn (3. 1. 135. 1: *ig-upadhebhya ' upasarge ' ka-vidhir, meṣādyarthaḥ* observed that roots with *i*, *u* or *ṛ* as the penultimate took the suffix *ka* in their primary formations, only when these roots were preceded by an Upasarga (and not as unspecified- i. e. bare as well as prefixed- *ig-upadha* roots as P had laid down by 3. 1. 135), Kty (3. 1. 135. 2: *na vā, budhādīnāṁ darśanād anupasarge' pi*) was required to reject that (generalised) thesis; for he detected in the usage instances going contrary to it, of forms ' like *budha-*', that did show *ka* at their end even when the roots at their base were not preceded by an Upasarga. This shows that the Pūrvapn did not not notice these forms in his usage, but that they formed a part of the usage of Kty (and perhaps even of that of P). Only such an assumption explains the former's difference with P and desire to restrict the scope of his rule.

Ptj, in his amplification of the Vt (3.1.135.2), explains '*budhādi* with the forms, *budha-* "awaking, intelligent, wise" (from √*budh-*), *bhida-* " who breaks " (from √*bhid-*,). *yudha-* " who fights " (from √*yudh-*) and *siva-* " who sews or stitches " (from √*siv-*). Here again there is no ' *budhādi*'-*gaṇa* to be found in *GP*. It may be noted that √*siv-* appears both with *ac*, as *seva-*, and with *ka*, as *siva-*. We have to assume, on the authority of Ptj's tradition, that Kty meant all these forms to be occurring in the usage of his times.

A further implication of Kty's statement can be that these forms when preceded by an Upasarga, also (*api*), show the suffix *ka*. (E. g. *vibudha-* etc. from the Epics ?) However, this implication istapt to be far-fetched, as the phrase *anupasarge'pi* is more properly to be connected with ' *kavidhiḥ* ' and hence as indicating a generalised statement, than narrowly with ' *budhādīnām* ' We are also not in possession of actual evidence of such usage of the times.

Ptj's explanation of ' *budhādi* ' shows that he had all those forms in his usage.

Whether P knew any of these forms cannot be said definitely : at the same time it can be said that it is not unlikely that he knew all of them, as in his rules he shows knowledge of all the four roots that are at the base of these forms and that can take the suffix *ka* by his rule (3. 1. 135),

In the assumption of the knowledge of these forms by P, Kty and Ptj, however, we have to face a gap of their non–use by the Purvapn of Kty who might have been either his predecessor or contemporary. Can this be met by assuming involvement of the geographical factor here, saying that the Pūrvapn belonged to a distant region where these forms were not in use in the local dialect ?

In literature only *budha*— is found (probably earliest in *MBhr* and *Manu*); while *siva*– is found only in the lexicons.

Obsn 81 : (i) P used agent forms made out of (a Subantopapada) + √*shā*– + *ka*.

(ii) Kty used such forms, plus action forms formed out of the same : which of the latter type he used is not known.

(iii) Ptj too used both these types of forms, his usage of the latter type containing the forms, *ākhūttha*–, *śyenottha*– and *śalabhottha*–.

After P noted forms with *ka* after any *ā*– ending root not preceded by an Upasarga but having a Karman as the Upapada (3. 2. 3), he detected forms with *ka* after √*sthā*– having any Subanta as the Upapada. So he framed the rule, *supi sthaḥ* (3. 2. 4). All these forms, as a general rule, carried the agent sense (by *kartari kṛt*, 3. 4. 67). But, in addition to such (*ca*), Kty noted in his usage forms made out of the same type of units as mentioned by P but carrying the action sense; hence his Vt *supi stho bhāve ca* (3. 2. 4. 1)[328].

The actual examples supplied by Ptj of this additional usage are[329] :

---

[328] There is an objection raised here, not to the point made in the present Vt, but to the very necessity of framing it. There is a general Vt laid down by Kty later by which the suffix *ka* is said to carry the sense(s) of the suffix *ghañ* when it follows √*sthā*- and some other roots (3.3.58.4 : *ghañ-arthe ka-vidhānaṁ sthā-snā-pā-vyadhi-hani-yudhy-artham*); and the *ghañ-artha* is known to be the action-sense and the non-nominative case-notion, as recorded by Kaiy there (231 b: *bhāvaḥ kartṛ-varjitaṁ ca kārakaṁ ghañ-arthaḥ*). Thus, the point of the present Vt (3.2.4.1) having been served by the general Vt itself, it is apparently futile to have the present Vt. — This is answered differently by Kaiy and NBh : Kaiy (162 a) says that the general Vt (having specifically nothing to do with an Upapada) forms a genitive compound **by option,** as against the present Vt which (specifically having a Subanta as the Upapada) forms the same type of a compound (cf. *ākhūttha-*) **invariably** by the rule, *upapadam atiṅ* (2.2.19). NBh (162b) sees only the non-nominative case-notion as the *ghañ-artha,* and hence as the *kapratyayārtha* (perhaps guided by the usages illustrated by Ptj there, II. 150. 21-24), as being stated by the general Vt. (— which is against Kaiy —), and the action-sense by the present Vt.

[329] On the needless use of *ud-*, see for similar cases our remarks at **30.** *apalāpyā-*, **31.** *avadābhyā-*, **98.** *uṣṭra-praṇāya-* and **100.** *sukha-pratīkṣa-*.

ākhūttha- "the rising up of a rat or rats", *śyenottha-* "the rising up of a falcon" and *śalabhottha-* "the rising up of a moth or grass-hopper". Whether Kty used exactly these forms cannot be said definitely for want of evidence. (He uses *ākhu-* at 3. 2. 84. 4 and *śyena-* at 1. 2 64. 18.) It is at least certain Ptj had them in his usage; he even supplies the connected usage in the case of one as *ākhūttho vartate* (II. 98. 3).

The forms are not attested in literature.

Obsn 82 : (i) Probably P did not use forms like *kaccha-pa-*, *kaṭāha-pa-* and *dvi-pa-*.

(ii) Perhaps Kty too did not use them.

(iii) Ptj had those, and probably many other similar ones, in his usage.

It was seen that P used the agent-forms in *ka* (not only after any *ā*-ending root not preceded by an Upasarga and having a Karmopapada, vide 3.2.3, but also) after √*sthā-* having any Subanta as the Upapada (3.2.4). It was also seen that Kty used such, plus the action-forms formed from a Subantopapada, √*sthā-* and the suffix *ka*, which made him frame a supplementary rule (3. 2. 4. 1.) that included these latter type of forms.

As an improved suggestion, Kty asks us to 'interpret' the very rule (*supi sthaḥ*, 3.2.4) of P (that, as it was, did not establish the wanted action-forms) so as to make it yield them, by resorting to the device of Yoga-vibhāga (3.2.4.2: *yogavibhāgāt siddham*). On splitting the rule of P into '*supi*' and '*sthaḥ*' its second section, '*sthaḥ*', technically stood for '(*supi*) *sthaḥ* (*kaḥ*)' (cf. Ptj II.98.8 : *sthaś ca ko bhavati supi=iti,*), and yielded the desired forms that were earlier not obtained by the whole rule of P in an unsplit form.[330]

However, although Kty's intention of obtaining the additional desired forms was met by this device of Yoga-vibhāga, the same device served incidentally or secondarily to sanction other formations as well, all of which were probably not intended by Kty (excepting those showing a Karmopapada. The first section of the split-up rule, viz, '*supi*', which we would now examine, meant in the words of Ptj (— with Anuvṛtti from the previous rule 3.2,3, *āto ' nupasarge kaḥ*—) : '*supi cātaḥ ko bhavati*' (II.98.6.7); and that became capable of establishing

---

[330] The way is this : "On splitting the rule, it (i.e. the *ka* after √*sthā-*) is extricated from the agent(sense), but, at the same time, is not made to denote another (specific) sense; hence, as (there is the axiom that) 'suffixes whose significance is not specified (are to be taken to) become expressive of the inherent significance', it should be taken to denote the inh. sig....; and that, being expressive of the inh. sig. (which relating to the root is always 'action'), should be denoting action." (Cf. Ptj II. 98.9-12 : *yoga-vibhāgād ayaṁ kartur apakṛṣyate, na cānyasminn artha ādiśyate, 'nirdiṣṭārthāś ca pratyayāḥ svārthe bhavanti=iti svārthe bhaviṣyati .... so 'sau svārthe bhavan bhāve bhaviṣyati.*) The reasoning is based on Kty's maxim, *anādeśe svārtha-vijñānāt* (at : 3.3.19.1, 3.4.67.1 and 5.3.10.3).

not : the agent-forms (like *sama-stha-* or *āsana-stha-*) with *ka* **only after** √*sthā-* having a Subantopapada, as by P's undivided rule (3.2.4), *supi sthaḥ* (*kartari*) (*kaḥ*);

but : the agent-forms (like *kaccha-pa-*, *kaṭāha-pa-* and *dvi-pa-* with *ka* **after any ā-ending root** (like √*pā-*) having a Subantopapada (and not : merely a Karmopapada as stated by P at 3.2,3 and not clearly contradicated by Kty there or on 3.2.4). These latter are dissolved by Ptj respectively as *kacchena pibati, kaṭāhena pibati* and *dvābhyāṁ pibati* (II.9.7-8).

Thus, by *ātaś cānupasarge kaḥ* (3.2.3), the form *kaccha-pa-* could be derived by P (if he used it) apparently only as *kacchaṁ pāti* (or *pibati*); but by '*supi*' (the first section of 3.2.4), it was derived by Ptj (if not clearly by Kty) as *kacchena pibati* (or even *pāti*). Not only that; two more forms similarly showing a *tṛtīyānta* Upapada were supplied by Ptj in illustration of the split-portion, '*supi*'. That shows that forms of this type had a large frequency in his usage.

Curiously enough, both the etymologies of *kaccha-pa-* are found given by Yāska in *Nir* (4.18) p.82: *kacchapaḥ kacchaṁ pāti. kacchena pāti iti vā. kacchena pibati iti vā.* That means, that *kaccha-pa,* dissolved as *kacchena* etc. (by the rule '*supi*') was probably not used P or Kty, but by Yāska and Ptj. This accords with the suggestion that Yāska was later than P and Kty, but nearer to Ptj in time. [331]

However, it does not appear likely that forms ahowing a Subantopapada, any root and the suffix *ka* were not entirely known or used by P, although he did not derive them. For such forms are of common occurrence in literature. And at least one such form *pāda-pa-* " a tree " (from *pādaiḥ pibati iti*) is found, on a random look at his vocabulary, used by P himself (4.3.119 : *kṣudrā-bhramara-vaṭara-pādapād añ*). [332] In early literature, *pāda-pa-* in this sense is attested in *Manu* (8.246), *AV-Pariśiṣṭa*[333] (57.1 7, 71.15.1, 70 b. 6.2)[334] and in a v.l. at *MBhr* 12. 89. 4b.—This then is an instance at least of a form-type that P knew but still did not derive by means of a rule, prabably because the type was somewhat rare in his usage. Therefore, P's silence on a linguistic phenomenon does not necessarily prove his complete ignorance or non-use of it, but points to the probability of its absence in his usage as a wide or common characteristic that could have led to a generalised statment. As for Kty, however, there is a greater possibility of its existence in his usage (although he did not probably intend to derive them), as can be seen from the attestation in early literature.

---

[331] Cf. in chronological order : (i) LIEBICH, *Pāṇini* (1919), p. 19; (ii) SKÖLD, *Papers on Pāṇini* (1926), pp. 34, 35, 37, 40; (iii) THIEME, *ZDMG* 89. *23* - *24* (1935), and *Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen* (1958), pp. 46-49; and (iv) M. A. MEHENDALE, *Some Aspects of Indo-Aryan Linguistics* (1968), pp. 1-14.

[332] Another instance is the form *kulaṭā-* used by P (4.1.127 : *kulaṭāyā vā*) but not derived by his rules for the progressive single substitution (technically called the *para-rūpa ekādeśa*). It was left to Kty to list *kulaṭā-* among its instances, though as a member of a Gaṇa (6.1.94.4 : *śakandhvādiṣu ca*) and first specifically mentioned by Ptj (III. 75.20-21).

Though *kaccha-* is used by P twice (4.2. 126, 133), (—once, probably as the name of a region, 4.2 133—), among the Muni-traya *kaccha-pa-* is met only with Ptj who uses it five times and once its feminine, *kaccha-pī-*, also (II. 219.4). In early literature *kacchapa-* is found used in *MBhr* (1.25. 17), *Manu* (1.44, 12.42), *MānavaŚSū* 3.6. 16 (p. 102), *VārāhaŚSū* 2.1. 6. 36 (p. 81) and *GDhSū* (17.25). *dvi-pa-* is used in *MBhr*, *Rām* and *Manu* (7.192). *kaṭāha-pa-* is nowhere attested, and even *kaṭāha-* is not found with P or Kty.

Attempts at derivation of these forms are closely connected with efforts at understanding their meanings. About *kaṭāha-pa-* and *dvi-pa-* there is no difficulty; they can mean respectively, as explained by Ptj (supra), " one who drinks with two (organs, i. e. the proboscis and the mouth), (hence) an elephant. "

In *kaccha-pa*,

(1) the element °*pa-* can stand for the root √*pā-* (*pib-*) " to drink ", as taken by Ptj;

(2) or for the root √*pā-* " to protect ";

(3) *kaccha-* can mean " (a) the mouth or (b) the shell of a tortoise;"

(4) or " the watery ground or morass; "

(5) *kaccha°* can stand for *kaccham* (accusative);

(6) or for *kacchena* (instrumental).

— To enter into an examination of these, with a view to deciding the probable elements forming the basis of the compound-form and thus on the ultimate meaning of the form, is obviously a complicated matter which must be left out of the present note.

---

[333] Whose consolidation took place "somewhere roundabout the beginning of the Christian era" though the compilation was done a little earlier. See the unpublished thesis by B. R. MODAK, *A Study of the Ancillary Literature of the Atharvaveda, with special reference to the Pariśiṣṭas* (submitted to the University of Poona for the Degree of Ph.D., June 1959), p. 741.

[334] This reference was given to me by V. P. LIMAYE.

Thus we can only conclude by re-stating the facts—

(1) that P did **not** have many forms like *kaccha-pa-* in his usage;

(2) that, although Kty's device of Yoga-vibhāga was theoretically capable of it, Kty probably did not intend to derive *kaccha-pa-*, *kaṭāha-pa-* and *dvi-pa-* with the Subantopapada-s, *kacchena*, *kaṭāhena* and *dvābhyām*;, because he too may not have used them widely;

(3) that Ptj derived the forms with the Subantopapada-s; and

(4) that Yāska derived *kaccha-pa-* with a Karmopapada (cf. P's 3.2.3) as well as a Subantopapada.

Obsn 83 : (i) P used the forms, *tunda-parimṛja-* and *śoka=apanuda-* in their literal and general senses.

(ii) Kty used them in particular contexts only; outside those contexts he had the new forms. *tunda-parimārja-* and *śoka=apanoda-*, developed in his usage.

(iii) Ptj 's usage was identical with Kty's.

P, in general, noted the occurrence of Vṛddhi in √*mṛj-* followed by a suffix[335], and of Guṇa in a *laghūpadha* root (like √*nud-*) before a *sārva-dhātuka* or *ārdhadhātuka* suffix[336]. But he had in his usage the primary forms, *tuuda-parimṛja-* "stroking (one's) belly" and *śokāpanuda-* "removing sorrow" (obtained respectively from *pari-* √*mṛj-* and the Karmopapada *tunda-*, and *apa* √*nud-* and the Karmopapada *śoka-*), that did not show the Vṛddhi or the Guṇa. So he laid down (3.2.5) the primary suffix *ka* in these casee, as a *k-it* suffix debars the operations of Guṇa and Vṛddhi[338].

Kty, however, found in his usage forms used only in restricted contexts. According to his observation, *tunda-primṛja-* was in his time used specially to denote "a slothful or torpid fellow (whiling away time in stroking the stomach)", and *śokāpanuda-* to denote (positively) "giving delight" (and not just, negatively, 'removing sorrow'). Hence his note (3.2.5. 1 : *tunda-śokayoḥ parimṛjāpanudor ālasya-sukhāharṇayoḥ*), narrowing the earlier semantic sphere of the forms.

---

[335] *mṛjer vṛddhiḥ*, 7.2.114.

[336] *puganta-laghūpadhasya ca*, 7.3.86.

[337] It is not necessary here to go into the long and technical discussion carried by Kty and Ptj at 1.1.3. 7-10 and into the view of the "other grammarians" (— probably post-Pāṇinian or even post-Kātyāyana —) quoted by Ptj on 1.1.3.10 (*ihānye vaiyākaraṇā mṛjer ajādau saṁkrame vibhāṣā vṛddhim ārabhante*, I.48.9ff.) and examined by NBh here (163a). For, Ptj is seen twice elsewhere (I.24. 22-23, 43. 16-17) definitely to favour these two formations as being established by the present rule of P.

[338] *kṅiti ca*, 1.1.5.

Outside these particular contexts. the forms as noted by Ptj to have been implied by Kty were *tuuda-parimārja-* and *śokāpanoda-*, showing the Vṛddhi and Guṇa respectively; in that case, therefore, there would not be the suffiix *ka* but *aṇ* in the forms. Here *tunda-parimārja-* simply meant "one who strokes (one's) belly" (*yo hi tundaṁ parimārṣṭi, tundaparimārjaḥ sa bhavati*, Ptj II. 98. 16), and *śokāpanoda-* "one who alleviates grief (by teaching wisdom or philosophy)" (*yaś ca śokam apanudati,*[339] *śokāpanodaḥ sa bhavati*, Ptj II. 98, 17).

Ptj's clear and unambiguous explanation of Kty's Vt, strengthened actually by one connected usage (*śokāpanudaḥ putro jātaḥ* II. 98. 16), denotes that he had the peculiarity well alive in his usage too.

In literature, *tunda-parimṛja-* is found used in the *Anargharāghava* (7.110) of Murāri and *YCampū* (I. 402.7), and *śokāpanuda-* in the latter (l.c.) and perhaps anticipated in the *BGītā* (2.8) line, *na hi prapaśyāmi mamāpanudyād yac chokam ucchoṣaṇam indriyāṇām* (*MBhr* 6.24.8).

Obsn 84 · (i) P's usage did not contain the forms, *mūla-vibhuja-*, *nakha-muca-*, *kāka-guha-* and *sarasī-ruha-*; he knew *ku-muda-* but it is not known how he derived it.

(ii) Kty's usage showed the form, *mūla-vibhuja-*, and possibly some others from the above.

(iii) Ptj's usage showed all the five forms.

There were certain compound forms noted by Kty 'such as *mūla-vibhuja-*' which according to the rules of P would have appeared differently (taking a different suffix), but which in the usage of Kty's time were formed as showing the suffix *ka*. (This suffix, by 1.1.5, indicates absence of the Guṇa that is usually occasioned by 7.3.86 in the *laghūpadha* roots.) So at the end of his comments on the group of P's rules (3.2. 3-7) enjoining the suffix *ka* (*ka-prakaraṇe*), Kty remarked that in order to establish[340] such forms there should be an extra enumeration made of them in the context of rules about *ki* (3.2.5.2 : *ka-prakaraṇe mūlaavibhujādibhya*[340] *upasaṁkhyānam.*) Now '*mūlavibhujādi*' is noted[341] to be an Ākṛti-gaṇa, and hence we do not know which forms were included in it at the time of Kty. Ptj's amplification of the '*ādi*' gives three more forms besides the head-form. From that, however, we cannot be sure if all of them existed in the usage of Kty too.

---

[339] Cf. Kaiy (162b) : *yaḥ saṁsārānityatodbhāvanādinā śokam eva nivartayati, na tu sukham utpādayati, sa śokāpanodaḥ.*

[340] In confomity with his usual style, we had expected °*dīnām*. Cp. NBh (163a) *tādarthye caturthī.*

[341] First probably by *PdM* (547).

The four forms that Ptj (II.98. 19-20) has noted along with the context for each are :

1. *mūla-vibhuja-* " bending down roots "
   in (*mūlāni vibhujati=iti*[342]) *mūla-vibhujo rathaḥ*,
2. *nakha-muca-* " loosening (or released by) the nails " (?)
   in (*nakhāni muñcanti iti* or *nakhair mucyante iti*) *nakha-mucāni dhanūṁṣi*,
3. *kāka-guha-* " (to be) concealed (or saved) from the crows "
   in (*kākebhyo guhyante*[343] *iti*) *kāka-guhās tilāḥ*, and
4. *sarasī-ruha-* " growing in a lake (or a big lake) "
   in (*sarasi sarasyāṁ vā rohati*[44] *iti*) *sarasī-ruhaṁ kumudam*, or

4′. *ku-muda-* " deriving pleasure on the earth, (a term for) a white water-lily "
in (*kau modate*[45] *iti*) *sarasīruhaṁ kumudam*.

The feminine counterparts of these would be respectively,
°*bhujā-*, °*mucā-*, °*guhā-*, °*ruhā-* and °*mudā-*.

It may be noted that, from Ptj's manner of recording the illustrations in their contexts, it is the first, which is an adjectival form in the first three cases, that is the pertinent instance intended to be given. In the fourth or last case, however, either the first or the second form can serve as an example of the suffix *ka*; and *KV* has actually noted only the second one as the example, not even noting the first form that was supplied by Ptj.

It may be further noted that, while the first, the fourth and perhaps the second examples fit in with the general agent sense of the suffixes, the third and perhaps the second examples are to be understood, according to the rules of P, to be showing an objective suffix like *ghañ*.[346]

---

[342] Given by *KV* (170). The root here is √*bhuj-* "to bend or curve" (*DhP* 1418 *bhujo kauṭilye*) attested in *RV*.

[343] The *Ny* explanation (547) contains the Kṛtya-form, *gūhitavyāḥ*, and a remark (about the suffix *ka* as being *'tavyadādyapavādaḥ'*.

[344] Given by NBh (163a). In the first dissolution (with *sarasi*), the form is taken as an *aluk* Tatpuruṣa compound (by 6.3.14) with the lengthening in the final *i* of the first member effected by *anyeṣām api dṛśyante* (6.3.137) or by the Vedic rule, *supāṁ su-luk-pūrvasavarṇa*° .... (7.1.39). In the second dissolution (with *sarasyām*), the stem is supposed to be *sarasī-* of rare occurrence; cp. a Śl-Vt, *tatrāpi sarasī yadi* (I.73.3) and Ptj (l.c.) on it : *asti ca loke sarasī-śabdasya pravṛttiḥ. katham ? dakṣiṇāpathe hi mahānti sarāṁsi sarasya ity ucyante.* (Here further, *GRM*, p. 81, on Kārikā 47 : *sarasī. karṇāṭadeśe prasiddhir esā halantatvād aprāpte.*)

[345] Given by *KV* (170). *Ny* (547) remarks : *'tṛjādy-apavādaḥ'*. For views on the accent here, see *PdM* on 6.2.2.

[346] By *akartari ca kārake saṁjñāyām* (3.3.19). *PdM* (547) on *kāka-guha-* remarks : ..... *karmaṇi ka-pratyaya iṣyate, ato 'ghañ-arthe ka-vidhānam'* (3.3.58.4) *ityatredaṁ draṣṭavyam.* So too NBh (163a) : *'ghañ-arthe ka-vidhānam' ityanenāpi sidhyaty etat.* Thereby, however, they seem to be extending the scope of the phenomenon beyond what was specified in the same Vt (3.3.58.4 : *ghañ-arthe ka-vidhānaṁ, sthā-snā-pā-vyadhi-hani-yudhy=artham*).

Thus, in the absence of the present Vt enjoining the suffix _ka_, the forms in the same senses as intended would have been according to the rules of P :

1. (_mūla-_ + _vi-_ √_bhuj-_ + _aṇ_ (3.2.1) =) *_mūla-vibhoja-_,
2. (_nākha-_ + √_muc-_ + _ac_ (3.1.134) =) *_nakha-moca-_,
2′. (_nakha-_ + √_muc-_ + (_karmaṇi_) _ghañ_ (3.3.19) =) *_nakha-moca-_,
3. (_kāka-_ + √_guh-_ + (_karmaṇi_) _ghañ_ (3.3.19) =) *_kāka-goha-_,
4. (_sarasī-_ + √_ruh-_ + _ac_ (3.1.134) =) *_sarasī-roha-_,
4′. (_ku-_ + √_mud-_ + _ac_ (3.1.134) =) *_ku-moda-_

The feminine counterparts of these would have been respectively, °_bhojī-_, °_mocā-_, °_gohā-_, °_rohā,-_ and °_modā-_.

However, none of these forms, nor any of those noted by Ptj (with the exception of _ku-muda-_ and _sarasīruha-_), is attested in early literature. _Sarasīruha-_ occurs only in _Hariv_ 3.118.8 (p. 694b) as _sarasīruhekṣaṇa-_ and in the _Vikramāṅkadevacarita_ 11.2 as °_bandhu-_; but (the unlengthened) _sarasiruha-_ is seen at the _Kirātārjunīya_ 12.35 in _sarasiruhajanman-_. _kumuda-_, well known to classical Sanskrit, occurs even early in _AV_ (4.34.5 : _āṇḍikaṁ kúmudaṁ sáṁ tanoti_), _AV-P_ (6.22.8), _Rāṃ_ (5.55.1 : (_gaganārṇavam_) _sa-candra-kumudam_) and as a name in _MBhr_ (5.97.15, 99.12). Curiously enough, it is found occurring thrice in two rules of P (4.2.80,87),[347] never with Kty, and once in _M_ (I.301. 2-3) in the compound, _kumuda-śyenī-_ "lily-white (female)" (formed by the rule,2.1.55). _kāka-_, _nakha-_ and _saras_ are not found with Kty, though the last two are used by P.

That indicates that the starred forms, and even the _ka_-ending forms with the exception of _ku-muda-_, were not known or used by P; that the _ka_-ending compound formations came into the usage probably by the time of Kty; and that four (or five) such forms noted above were certainaly in vogue at the time of Ptj.

As for _kumuda-_ derived as above, it may be said that it is an example of a form known and even used by P though left underived by him, that Kty knew it and perhaps included it in the illustrative group of _mūlavibhujādi_ forms, and that Ptj though using it has given no indication that he meant to refer to **that** and not to _sarasī-ruha-_ as the fourth constituent of the _mūla_°-_gaṇa_, thus probably remaining silent on its derivation. —Alternatively, it is to be supposed that an entirely different derivation of the form was in the minds of P, Kty and Ptj.

Finally, it may be noted that the roots in all the four (or five) forms noted by Ptj, being _ig-upadha_, could have easily taken the suffix _ka_ by P's rule, _igupadha_° ...... _kaḥ_ (3. 1. 135), where only the condition about an Upapada is not mentioned. That, despite this fact, Kty has framed his Vt establishing the forms with the suffix *ka*, indicates that the forms were looked upon by him only as Upapada-compounds and hence as Nitya-samāsa forms (by 2. 2. 19).

---

[347] It is a member of the reconstructed _puṣkarādi-gaṇa_ of BIRWE (385).

Obsn 85 : (i) P, Kty and Ptj, all, had forms ending in *stha-* in their usage.

(ii) It cannot be said if either P or Kty used the form *śaṁ-stha-*.

(iii) Ptj had it in his usage.

P saw in his usage Upapada-compounds ending in a Kṛdanta from √*sthā-* followed by the suffix *ka* or the suffix *kvip*. So he laid down the rule, *sthaḥ ka ca* (3. 2. 77) [348] The fact that he does not specify the Upapada-s occurring in such compounds indicates that they were much common in the usage of his times.

Ptj has illustrated such a compound having as its final member a Kṛdanta from √*sthā-*, with the form *śaṁ-stha-* [349] " being in prosperity, happy ". For want of early attestation of the form we cannot suspect that the particular form was current either in the time of P or in the time of Kty, although we know that P had *śam-* in his usage (cf. 4.4. 143, 5.2 138) and that he even uses it as an Upapada (3.2.14).

The form is not found attested in literature.

Addenda to << 4 >>

(Formations by Sūtra-s 3.1.135, 136 and 3.2.3.)

Obsn 86 : (i) It is not known if P or Kty knew the forms, ***vikṣipa-*** and ***vilikha-***.

(ii) Ptj had them in his usage.

Thrice Ptj is seen (II. 78.17,20; 94.20–95.1) to refer to the forms, ***vikṣipa-*** " who throws or scatters about " and ***vilikha-*** " who writes or scratches". They are derivable by the rule, ***igupadha-jñā-prī-kiraḥ kaḥ*** (3. 1. 135), of P. (See also fn. 325.) However, neither the Veda, nor P nor Kty attest the presence of ***vilikha-*** in their vocabulary; but ***vikṣipa-*** is found in the Veda (*TĀr* 4.24, 25) [350] as a name according to Sāyaṇa (fn. 361). So it is uncertain whether the forms point to a new development by the time of Ptj or to a continuity of usage from the time of P.

---

[348] Although *ka* was already enjoined by the rule, *āto 'nupasarge kaḥ* (3.2.3), it was feared to be ruled out by the *ac* enjoined by *śami dhātoḥ saṁjñāyām* (3.2.14). That is the purpose, according to Ptj, of its being re-enjoined by the present Sūtra. Thereby, Ptj attributes upon P the intention to derive by 3.2.77 the compound (*śaṁ-stha-*) mainly with "*śam-*" as the Upapada. That also indicates Ptj taking *śaṁ-stha-* as a name.

[349] The root-final *ā* is elided before a *k-it* suffix by ***āto lopa iṭi ca*** (6.4.66).

[350] For the first quotation, see Obsn **93**.

The forms are recorded as *a-vikṣipa-* and *a-vilikha-* in connected usage by *KV* (543) on 6.2. 157 158; but *vilikha-* is not attested in literature, nor *vikṣipa-* in classical Sanskrit.

Obsn 87 : (i) It is not known if P or Kty knew the forms, *su-gla-* and *su-mla-*.

(ii) Ptj used them.

Ptj at one place (II 95. 11) makes a mention of the forms, *su-gla-* and *su-mla-* " very weary", formed respectively from the roots, *√glai-* and *√mlai-*, preceded by the Upasarga *su-* and followed by the suffix *ka*. These are formed by the rules, *ād eca upadeśe ' śiti* (6.1.45), *ātaś copasarge* (3.1.136) and *āto lopa iṭi ca* (6. 4. 64) of P. The rule 3. 1. 136, however, is not commented upon by Kty or Ptj.– *√mlai-* is not found with P or Kty, but *√glai-* is at 3.2.139, 3.4. 65 with P and at 3.3.95.4 with Kty.

The forms are not attested in literature.

Obsn 88 : P, Kty and Ptj, all, had the form *jña-* in their usage.

P had in his usage the form *jña-* " one who knows, intelligent, wise ". So he derived it by the rules, *igupadha-jñā-prī-kiraḥ kaḥ* (3.1.135) and *āto lopa iṭi ca* (6. 4. 64). — Ptj has once given probably the same derivation of the form, as *jānāti=iti jñaḥ* (II. 95.2). Besides that, he has used it at one place as an adjective in the masc. and fem. genders (cp. *jñānāṁ brāhmaṇānām apatyam* and *jñayor brāhmaṇyor apatyam* twice each, II. 190.22-26), and as a fem. noun in two contexts (viz. *jñāyā odano jñaudanaḥ*, I. 306.23, and *jñā devatā 'sya sthālīpākasya jñaḥ sthālīpākaḥ* III. 232. 6f., 323. 3). — Kty has once, independently of P, used the root *√jñā-* (3.1.26. 11 : *nakṣatra-yoge jñi*); and that should indicate that he too had the form *jña-* in his usage.

Hence, the form in all probability shows a continuity of usage.

In early literature it is found to occur in *ŚBr* (14. 7. 23), the *Śvetāśvataropaniṣad* (1.9; 6. 2, 16), the *Praśnopaniṣad* (5.6) and *MBhr* (12. 308. 176).

Obsn 89 : (i) It is not known, but it is possible, that P or Kty had the form, *artha-jña-*, in their usage.

(ii) Ptj had it in his usage.

The form, *artha-jña-* " one who understands the sense, expert or experienced in a matter ", could be derived by the rule, *āto ' nupasarge kaḥ* (3. 2.3) of P. But for want of evidence it cannot be positively stated that either he or Kty had it in their usage. Ptj has mentioned it once (II.95.2f.), deriving it as an Upapada-compound, That shows that it was current in his times.

In literature, the form is found to occur in *Nir*, once (1.18) as *yo 'rthajña it sakalaṁ bhadram aśnute* in a stanza (also found at *ŚāĀr* 14.2), and again (1.19) used as *ity arthajña-praśaṁsā*; it is also found used in *Rām* (3.69.1).

Obsn 90 : (i) P did not use the feminine Upapada-compound forms ending in *pā*-(but those ending in *pī*-) from either √*pā*- "to drink" or √*pā*- "to protect",

(ii) Kty and Ptj used (a) compounds ending in *pā*- from √*pā*-"to drink and having an Upapada (like *kṣīra*- which is) other than *surā*- or *sīdhu*-, and (b) compounds ending in *pā*- from √*pā*- " to protect" when the Upapada could be *surā*- or *sīdhu*-.

Differing from the usage of P who used *pī*-ending feminine compounds, where √*pā*- meant " to drink " or "to protect" (*gā-poṣ ṭak.* 3.2.8), Kty used *pā*-ending compounds (by *āto 'nupasarge kaḥ* 3.2.3) when √*pā*- meant "to drink" and the Upapada was other than *surā*- or *sīdhu*- (*surā-sīdhvoḥ pibateḥ*, 3.2.8.1). Ptj has illustarated it with *kṣīra-pā*- "drinking milk" in the phrase *kṣīrapā brāhmaṇī* (II.99.3). (*kṣīra*- is found with P at 4.2.20, 7.1.51, and with Kty at 2.1.1.15, 7.1.51.2). —Further Kty implied that he used forms with √*pā*- meaning "to protect" even when the Upapada was *surā*- or *sīdhu*-. Thus, he as well as Ptj might have used *surā-pā*- (II.99.4) and **sīdhu-pā*- "protecting wine".

For a detailed discussion on the usages and their attestation, see Obsn **113**.

Obsn 91: (i) P did not use *pā*-ending feminine compound forms that were conventional terms.

(ii) Kty used such forms.

(iii) Ptj's usage was probably similar to Kty's.

In the case of *pā*-ending Upapada-compounds, Kty differed from the usage of P in one more respect. When it was a conventional term (Saṁjñā-śabda), Kty used either a *pā*-ending or a *pī*-ending form (*bahulaṁ taṇi* 3.2.8.2); P used only the *pī*-ending form. Ptj has not given illustration of this important observation of Kty; but his silence may be taken as indicative of agreement with Kty.

For a detailed discussion on the usages see Obsn **114**.

<< 5 >> FORMS IN $-A_3$ (*ŚA*)

(Sūtra-s : 3.1.137-139)

Obsn 92 : (i) P had in his usage the name-form *vyāghra-* (which he did not derive), and perhaps had *vyājighra-* or *vijighra-* also.

(ii) Kty had *vyāghra-* and probably the two other forms also.

(iii) Ptj had *vyāghra-*; whether he used the other two cannot be said definitely.

P lays down in general (3.1.136 : *ātaś copasarge*) the suffix *ka*[351] to get the primary forms from *ā*-ending roots preceded by an Upasarga. So, by this from *vy-ā-* √*ghrā-* could have been formed the (noun) form, *vyāghra-* " one who goes about scenting or smelling (the animals of prey), (hence :) a tiger "; and this he actually had in his usage (cf. *upamitaṁ vyāghrādibhiḥ sāmānya-prayoge*, 2.1.56). — But this general rule is superseded by the special one that immediately follows (3.1.137 : *pā-ghrā-dhmā-dheṭ-dṛśaḥ śaḥ*), by which from √*ghrā-*, and four other roots preceded by an Upasarga, he derives primary forms with the suffix *śa*.[352] This latter rule would be deriving not the form *vyāghra-*, but only a form like *vy-ā-jighra-* or *vi-jighra-* from √*ghrā-* when preceded by an Upasarga, and a form **ghrāya-* (with *ṇa* by 3.1.141) from the bare √*ghrā-*.[353]

That would mean that though P used the form *vyāghra-*, (1) either he left it underived, (2) or he did not derive it from *vy-ā-* √*ghrā-*. The second alternative does not seem to be possible. Yāska and Ptj are found deriving *vyāghra-* from *vyā-* √*ghrā-*, thus : *vyāghro vyāghrāṇāt* (alternatively, *vyādāya hanti=iti vā.*) (*Nir* 3.18); *vyājighrati=iti vyāghraḥ* (*M* II.92.6) : " *vyāghra-* (' a tiger ') is so (called) because it goes about scenting or smelling (the animals of prey)."[353a] — So we have to accept only the first possibility which is not uncommon with P.

---

[351] Causing elision of the Aṅga-final *ā* before a vowel-beginning *Ārdhadhātuka k-it* or *ṅ-it* suffix, by the rule, *āto lopa iṭi ca* (6.4.64).

[352] Causing the first three roots from 3.1.137 to be substituted before a *ś-it* suffix, respectively by *piba, jighra* and *dhama* (by 7.3.78) wherein the final *a* is '*uccāraṇārtha*' (cf. NBh, 154a).

[353] Or, not *ghrāya* but even *jighra-* (with *śa*) from the bare √*ghrā-*, — if the condition '*upasarge*' from the preceding rule were not taken to follow in the present rule, thus making the present rule applicable unconditionally (*aviśeṣeṇa*) to the five roots. This view has been referred to by *KV* (168), probably not quite approvingly, thus : *upasarga iti 'kecin' nānuvartayanti*.

Kty prohibits the use of the suffix *śa* after √*ghrā*- in a resultant noun form (3.1.137. 1: *jighraḥ saṁjñāyām pratiṣedhaḥ*). Thereby, he derives the noun form, *vyāghra*-, with *ka* (by 3.1.136),and probably also, by implication, the simple or adjectival forms, *vyājighra*- and/or *vijighra*- [354] with *śa*, in the sense of merely "one who smells about".

Ptj, while explaining the Vt, records the forms, *vyāghra*-, along with its derivation to which reference is made above. He is also once found to use the feminine noun form, *vyāghrī*- (II. 219.4). That shows that he was quite familiar with the form.[355] —He, however, does not bring out the obvious implication of Kty about the counter-forms mentioned above. For, in this case he does not record in his usual style a counter-example showing a different formation in a different context (in some such words as '*vyājighraḥ ity evānyatra* (i.e. *asaṁjñāyām*)'). That possibly shows that Kty had the adjectival form, *vyājighra*- or *vijighra*-,[356] beside the noun form, *vyāghra*-, but that Ptj had in his usage only the latter (i.e. the noun), not the former (i.e. the adjective). Or is it likely that he really had the former as well, but that he just did not (or forgot to) mention it?

Attempts at interpreting the Vt of Kty in different ways, made before Ptj and as such recorded by him .(II.92.6-8), end in deriving the same forms as noted above and hence are not significant as suggestions of different usages.

All this shows that at least the form, *vyāghra*-, was in continuous use from the time of P upto the time of Ptj.

In early literature, *vyāghra*- occurs in the Veda, *MBhr* and *Rām*; *jighra*- is found only as a compound-final in a stanza quoted in *SāhD* (on 3.66: *mano*-

---

[353a] For other (Indo-Aryan and Dravidian) derivations suggested, MAYRHOFER, *EtW* (1970) III. 274, who, however, feels that the current (*Nir*) derivation here was an explanation by folk-etymology of what was a non-Aryan word. See also GONDA against this derivation (fn. 80a : p. 197, fn. 3).

[354] Or, *jighra*- as well. See fn. 353.

[355] Explaining why an unattested form like **āḍhyī-bhaviṣṇu* (where *āḍhyī* is a Cvyanta and hence a Gati) in the Tācchīlika sense cannot be derived with the suffix *iṣṇuc* enjoined in the *tā*° sense after √*bhū*- (3.2.138), Ptj says that *tā*° words are like conventional terms, and the conventional terms cannot be further qualified by Gati-s. (*rūḍhiśabdaprakārās tācchīlikā; na ca rūḍhiśabdā gatibhir viśeṣyante. na hi bhavati pra-devadatta iti*. II. 105.19f.)

At this Kaiy points out that inclusion of Gati-s within conventional terms is not to be questioned when the latter have already come to possess them as in *vyāghra*- etc. (*vyāghra=ādayas tu sopasargā eva rūḍhiśabdāḥ*, 169).

[356] *vi-jighra*- has been actually quoted by *KV* (168) as being formed directly by the rule of P (3.1.137).

jighraḥ[357] *sapatnījanaḥ*); but *vyājighra-*, *vijighra-* and **ghrāya-* are not attested. The *PhiṭSūtra* mentions *vyāghrá-* (II.17).

Obsn 93: (i) P used the form *limpa-* but not (the Vedic form) *nilimpa-*.

(ii) Kty and Ptj noted probably the Vedic as well as the secular usage of *nilimpa-*

(iii) It is not known definitely whether Kty used *limpa-*; Ptj probably used it.

From the roots √*lip-* "to smear"[358] efc., not accompanied by an Upasarga P had the forms, *limpa-* "one who smears" etc., showing the nasal infix ; so he laid down (3.1.138) the suffix *śa* (which brings in the nasal by 7.1.59) to derive those forms. But Kty saw one form, *nilimpa-* (that was, according to Ptj the name of a class of gods), showing the same suffix *śa* after √*lip-* that was preceded by an Upasarga, viz., *ni*. So he took note of the form in a Vt (3.1.138.1 : *anupasargān nau limpeḥ*).

Now, *limpa-*, derived by P, is nowhere attested in literature, except in the lexicons as the name of one of Śiva's attendants. But *nilimpa-* is found used in the Veda (and later as *nilimpa-ka-* in *YCampū* I.18.2). It occurs as the name of a class of divinities in *AV* (*nilimpā́ nā́ma devā́ḥ* 3.26.5[359]), *TS* (*nilimpā́ nā́ma* 5.5.10.3[360]) and *TĀr* (*dhúniś ca......nilimpáś ca vilimpáś ca vikṣipáḥ* 4.24[361]). Of these the last text notes also the form *vilimpa-* which seems to have escaped the notice of Kty as well as that of Ptj. Further, Ptj's gloss on the Vt in the words, *nilimpā nāma devāḥ* (II.92.12), is most probably a quotation from *AV*.

---

[357] As an Upapada-compound this is ordinarily not justifiable; by *āto 'nupasarge kaḥ* (3.2.3) the form ought to be *'mano-ghra-'* with *ka* after the bare √*ghrā-*, but it is not attested. A stray case like *'mano-jighra-'* can only be justified as a Ṣaṣṭhī-tatpuruṣa compound.

[358] The use here in the Sūtra (3.1.138 : *anupasargāl limpa-vinda- ....*) of '√*limp-*' showing the nasal even before √*lip-* got it before *śa* (by the rule, *śe mucādīnām*, 7.1.59), is apparently without reason, or is for the sake of harmony with the immediately following '√*vind-*' where the use of the nasal was necessary for the identification of the root. *TattvaB* too does not suggest a reason for the nasal in *limpa-*. (*iha limpa-vinda=iti bhāvinā numā sanumkau nirdiṣṭau; tena lābhārthasyaiva vinder grahaṇam, na tu sattādyarthakānām.* 489).

[359] Where R. T. H. GRIFFITH in his Translation (I. 120) writes in the footnote : "perhaps smearers, lickers (of themselves)".

[360] On this the commentator Bhaṭṭa Bhāskara writes, *'ni° nāma gandharvās stha nitarāṁ liptāḥ'* (— which is, however, in objective sense); and KEITH translates the text (in the subjective sense) as "Ye are smearers by name" (p. 450).

[361] Sāyaṇa states, *'dhunyādīni sapta padāni gaṇagatānāṁ marudviśeṣāṇāṁ nāmadheyāni'* (ed. PHADKE, p. 332).

There is one more point to note. Kty does not mention in this Vt that he wants *nilimpa-* to convey a Saṁjñā or a name (as Ptj wants it to do) and not an adjectival sense (such as "smearing thickly"). But the Vedic usage strongly favours the Saṁjñā force. Does Kty want us to understand here also, presence of the expression '*saṁjñāyām*' occurring at the end of the following Vt (3.1.138.2 : *gavi ca vindeḥ saṁjñāyām*), by means of the '*ca*' from that Vt? Or, does he really mean to note only an adjective-form (*nilimpa-*) by the present Vt and a noun-form by the next Vt? The latter alternative is not easily acceptable, in view of the definite Saṁjñā-usages of the form in the Veda and in view of non-attestation of the form elsewhere in early literature.

All this means

(1) that *limpa-* was used as an adjective at the time of P;

(2) that the Vedic noun *nilimpa-* was not much used in his time, which was the reason why he did not derive it, and not that he used _*nilipa-_ (of no attestation) in its stead (derived from *sopasarga* √*lip-* with *ka* by 3.1.135);

(3) that Kty's society probably borrowed the noun *nilimpa-* from the Veda and gave it some currency in their usage (— which is obvious from the fact that he does not restrict his note to the Veda as he does in that case[362]); and

(4) that *TĀr* text showing *vilimpa-* also beside *nilimpa-* was **not noticed** either by Kty or by Ptj.

Whether Kty did or did not continue to use the adjective *limpa-* as well that was in the usage of P, we are unable to say definitely for want of more evidence. But Kty's note cannot be taken to be a corrective one, i.e. as establishing *nilimpa-* in the place of *limpa-* noticed by P, or as implying to have _*lipa-_ or _*vilipa-_ (with *ka* bringing no nasal) in the absence of the Upasarga *ni*, as these are not found in usage at any time.

As for Ptj, he could be said to be having *limpa-* in his usage as is indicated by his reference to it at one place (cf. *anupapadasya=avakāśaḥ* : *limpati=iti limpaḥ*, II.95. 6-7).

Obsn 94 : (i) P used the form *vinda-*, but not the names, *go-vinda-*, *ara-vinda-* etc.

(ii) Kty used the name *go-vinda-*, but not *ara-vinda-*; he may have used *vinda-*.

(iii) Ptj had in his usage the names, *go-vinda-*, *ara-vinda-* and many such others ending in *vinda-*; he may have used the form *vinda-* also.

---

[362] Cf. 3.1.108.1, 118.1, 2.15.4.

Form the roots, √*vid-* "to obtain", etc., not preceded by an upasarga, P (3.1.138) had the forms, *vinda-*, "acquiring", etc., showing the nasal infix and so the suffix *śa* that technically brought it (the nasal) by 7.1.59.

Now, from Kty's principle, *akārād anupapadāt karmopapado vipratiṣedhena* (3.2. 1.6), Ptj has evolved the *madhye'pavāda-nyāya* or the maxim imparting greater weight to an exception than to a rule that preceds it, but not than to a rule that follows it, which latter, therefore, supersedes the exception itself. (*madhye' pavādāḥ pūrvān vidhīn bādhante,* II.95.10.) By this, the present rule (3.1.138) can set aside the (previous) rule, *igupadha-jñā-prī-kiraḥ kaḥ* (3.1.135), but not the oncoming rule, *karmaṇy aṇ* (3.2.1) which is to be taken to be more powerful. (*ity evaṁ, śaḥ kaṁ bādhiṣyate, karmopapadaṁ na bādhiṣyate,* II.95. 10-11.) — That means that, if *go-* were a Karmopapada to √*vid-*, the primary form from that would (by *karmaṇy aṇ*) be **go-veda-*.

Thus Kty should be theoretically supposed to be using adjectival forms like **go-veda-* "acquirer of cows", **madhu-veda-* "acquirer of honey" etc. But, he tells us that he had in his usage (— probably besides the earlier *vinda-* —) 'a name' *go-vinda-*, showing *śa* and not *aṇ*. (3. 1. 138. 2: *gavi ca vindeḥ saṁjñāyām.*) That implies that when **not** a name but **just** an adjective carrying the literal sense (as above), from *go-* and √*vid-* he still had **go-veda-* (with *aṇ*) in his usage. However, in literature forms like **go-veda-*, **madhu-veda-* etc. are not met with. Hence, Kty's Vt (3. 1. 138. 2) may not be necessarily understood as implying those counter-forms, but as just recording the form *go-vinda-* without meaning to lay any stress on the Saṁjñā-nature of it.

The form *go-vinda-* occurs in literature probably first in *MBhr* as the name of lord Kṛṣṇa (cp. *gāṁ vindatā bhagavatā govindena=amitaujasā* 1. 19. 11), he being "the winner (or rather 'the master[363] of cows" (cp. *govindas-*

---

[363] The form is actually suspected by BÖHTLINGK and ROTH (*PW* 2.816) to be a prakritisation of '*gopendra-*' "the chief herdsman", that is also used as an epithet of Kṛṣṇa in the *Durgā-stotra,* included in some MSS. in *MBhr* (after 6.22.16). This derivation bears similarity with the one given in *Hariv* 2.19.45 (p. 195) = Cri. Ed. 62.43: *ahaṁ kila=indro devānāṁ, tvaṁ gavām indratāṁ gataḥ / govinda iti lokās tvāṁ stoṣyanti bhuvi śāśvatam //* It may be interesting to note in this connection the derivation given of *kuvinda-* (∼ *kupinda-*) "a weaver" by *USū, kuper vā vaś ca* (4.86), from √*kup-* with the suffix (*k*)*inda*(*c*). — By this derivation of '*govinda-*', additional (name or noun) forms ending in *vinda-* that are shortly noted by Ptj would have to be taken as formed only on the **analogy** of *govinda-*, having nothing to do with √*vid.* — V. P. LIMAYE (*CSM*, p. 189f.) seems to suggest that *govinda-* might be derived from *govindú-* occurring in the Veda (*RV* 9.96.19) and that Sāyaṇa there derives it (as a Ṣaṣṭhī-tatpuruṣa compound from *go-* and *vindu-*) by quoting P's rule, *vindur icchuḥ* (3.2.169) which records *vindu-* as an irregular form showing the (Tacchīlādi) suffix *u*. This deserves a careful study into which it is not necessary to go here.

tasmāt satyo' pi nāmataḥ// ...... ucyate/ ...... govindo vedanād gavām// 5. 68. 12–13), or being " the winner of the earth " (cp. *naṣṭāṁ ca dharaṇīṁ pūrvam avindaṁ vai guhāgatām/ govinda iti māṁ devā vāgbhiḥ samabhituṣṭuvuḥ //* 12. 330. 5).

Now, Ptj steps in with the observation that Kty's reference to *go-vinda-* makes a much incomplete enumeration (*atyalpam idam ucyate 'gavi'=iti,* II.92. 14–15); actually there were many such forms noted by him that showed a similar formation (i.e. the compound-final *vinda-* and probably also the nature of being a 'noun' if not a 'name'). Hence he wants *'gavi'* from the Vt to be corrected into *'gavādiṣu'* (— with a plural, it may be noted). (*gavādiṣv iti vaktavyam,* II.92.15.) He cites one such example, *ara-vinda-*, ordinarily meaning "a lotus)" [364] so called probably because it is like a wheel " possessed of spokes (that resemble the lotus-petals)".[365] That shows that after Kty and by the time of Ptj *vinda-*ending nouns had developed in the usage in profussion; and it was probably thought sufficient only to refer, with just one more example, to the point that was of wide experience to the students of Ptj.

The form *ara-* is found used in the Veda though not by Kty; but *ara-vinda-* is found included in the *puṣkarādi-gaṇa* [366] that is mentioned by P at 5.2.135. From this, however, we cannot say that P knew the form. It is probably first attested in *Rām* (3.71.19 etc.). BÖHTLINGK and ROTH have noted the additional *vinda-*ending names, *cāru°-, bhadra°-, mitra°-, vatsa°-* (*PW* 6.1096) and *anu°-*. All these are found as names in early literature. Thus, *anu-vinda-* and even *vinda-* as names are of frequent occurrence in *MBhr* [367]; *mitra-vinda-* as an adjective ("friend-winning") occurs in *MBhr* (3.210.19) and as a (feminine) name in *ŚBr* (11.4.3.20) *ŚŚSū* (3.7.1) and the *ĀŚSū* (2.11.1); [368] and most of the other forms occur in *Hariv*. Dictionaries like *pw* and *VWC* have further noted *kuru°-, vasu°-* and *sarva°-*; of these, the first one occurs in *BŚSū* (24.5), and the next two occur both in *KāṭhGSū* (4.20) and in *GDhSū* (26.12).

While this makes us wonder how at least a very old name like *mitra-vindā-* escaped the notice of Kty, the fact remains that name-forms ending in *vinda-* had gained a large currency by the time of Ptj larger than that at the time of Kty.

---

[364] Ptj cites just the form and that too with the masculine gender, *ara-vindaḥ,* after *go-vindaḥ.* So too does *KV*. In the classical literature, however, the form is generally used with the neuter gender and to mean "a lotus". In the Pāṇinian school this latter is probably first noted in the *Rūpāvatāra* of Dharmakīrti. (II. 258).

[365] Cf. *arākārāṇi dalāny ara-śabdenocyante* (*PdM* 532); and *TattvaB* (489).

[366] Though not in its reconstruction by BIRWE (385).

[367] See SÖRENSEN, pp. 61 and 794 (on *anuvinda-*) and 737 f. (on *vinda-*).

[368] On *'mitravindā mahāvairājī',* Nārāyaṇa in his *Vṛtti* says, *mitrāṇi yayā vindate sā. 'guṇa-nāma'=etat* (p. 81).

<< 6 >> FORMS IN -A_4 (ṆA)

(Sūtra-s : 3.1.139-143)

Obsn 95 : (i) P knew the form *tana-*, but probably not *avatāna-*; he did not derive them.

(ii) Kty knew those and also *tāna-*. Probably he wanted to derive all of those.

(iii) Ptj has recorded only *avatāna-*, Probably from his usage.

P (3. 1. 140) had laid down use of the suffix *ṇa* (causing Vṛddhi to the penultimate *a* by 7. 2. 116), beside optionally (by *'vibhāṣā'* drawn from 3. 1. 139) that of the general suffix *ac*,[369] after roots baginning with √*jval-*[370] and ending with √*kas-*[370] from *DhP*, when those roots were not preceded by an Upasarga (by *'anupasargāt'* from 3. 1. 138). Among the list of these roots Kty wants to have an additional enumeration of √*tan-* that was not included there[371] (3. 1. 140. 1 : *tanoter ṇa upasaṁkhyānam*). That means he wants to get the forms, *tāna-* (with *ṇa*) and *tana-* (with *ac*) " that which spreads". Ptj's illustration of the Vt is *avatāna-* " bending or stretching downwards " (*avatanoti=ity avatānaḥ*, II. 92. 18); and we also get in *M* once an instance of the actual use of that form made by Ptj (cp. *vṛkṣastho ' vatāno vṛkṣe chinne ' pi na vinaśyati*, I. 247.9f. on 1. 2. 64. 57).[372]

Probably on the basis of the nature of the example given by Ptj (—showing the suffix *ṇa* alone **only when** after √*tan-* preceded by an Upasarga, *ava*—) it seems to be *SK* (2902) which is the first to note on this Vt, *iha 'anupasargād' iti 'vibhāṣā' iti ca na saṁbadhyate.* It appears that BhD was led to understand the Vt thus, first by the use in the Vt of only *ṇaḥ* (– what was really Kty's Pratīka-word for the Sūtra he was commenting upon–) and secondly by Ptj 's only expample, *'avatānaḥ'*, that showed only *ṇa* and an Upasarga.

---

[369] *KV* (168), *aco 'pavādaḥ*, and on it : *jvalādīnām pacādyantaḥpātitvāt* (*Ny* 533), and *tasyāpi sarvadhātuviṣayatvād iti bhāvaḥ* (*PdM* 533).

[370] Although *'jvala dīptau'* has been referred to twice in *DhP* (nos. 804, 831), it is one and the same root mentioned at different places for different purposes. For the present purpose of marking the earlier limit for the operation of the suffix *ṇa*, it is only the second √*jval-* (no. 831) that is intended here. This is clear from the use, before no. 831, of *'vṛt'* that usually marks the end of a sub-section in *DhP*. *SK* (p. 376) also remarks on √*jval-* no. 804 : *ṇa-pratvayārthaṁ paṭhiṣyamāṇa evāyaṁ mittvārtham anūdyate.* See also *Ny* and *PdM* (533). — √*kas-* is no. 860, *kasa gatau.*

[371] *DhP* 1464, *tanu vistāre.*

[372] Kaiy (II. 101a) explains *avatānaḥ* as *drākṣādilatāvatānaḥ.*

This interpretation of the Vt would mean that Kty wanted to get only forms like *avatāna-* that showed an Upasarga and the suffix *ṇa*, but not those not containing an Upasarga nor those showing an optional use of *ac* (not causing the Vṛddhi) and *ṇa*. Actually, however, as we have seen, Kty's Vt does **not** show any indication that he means in this Vt to put a stop to the Anuvṛtti of '*anupasargāt*' or to disallow an optional use of the general suffix *ac* (i. e. to put a stop to the Anuvṛtti of '*vibhāṣā*'); and it may be noted that these Anuvṛtti-s are at the same time supposed by the scholiasts to be present in the very rule of P that Kty is commenting upon !

Evidence of the usages of *tāna-* and *tana-*(established by understanding the presence of '*anupasargāt*' and '*vibhāṣā*' in the Vt) are supplied in *KŚSū* (1. 8. 18), *MBhr* (2. 4. 33, 2. 10. 9 etc.), *Kumāra* (1. 8) and *Suśruta* (for *tāna-*), and in *RV*[373], *AV* and *TBr* (for *tana-*). The reason for P's not deriving them seems to be their absence in his usage. The former one, *tāna-*, Kty must have known well and wanted to derive; and having known *tana-* to be occurring in the Veda though not in the current speech, he would not have stopped to derive that form as well by means of an additional rule on the Sūtra of P, just as he has added the Vedic *nilimpa-* at 3. 1. 138. 1. [374]—As for *avatāna-*, it is found to occur in *ŚBr* four times (9. 1. 1.27, 31), and also in *aśvāvatāna-* included in the *gopavanādi* (2. 4. 67) sub-class of the *bidādi-gaṇa* (4. 1. 104).[375] P did not derive the *ŚBr avatāna-*,[376] because he probably did not know that eastern text. (See fns. 296, 297.) We find it attested in *Rām* (5. 12. 26) and *MBhr* (2. 9. 3, 3. 25.26). It is very likely, therefore, that Kty wanted to derive this form (or such *sopasarga* forms) as well.

That suggests that by his Vt (3. 1. 140. 1) Kty was establishing forms from √*tan-*, both without and with an Upasarga, and with both *ṇa* and *ac*; and that we do not get an alternative form like **avatana-* (with *ac*) from Ptj, simply because it was not found in his usage ('*anabhidhānāt*'),[377] A further search for more data could perhaps have secured, if not that very form, a form formed from some Upasarga, √*tan-* and *ac*. Ptj's silence about *tāna-* and *tana-* also suggests that he did not find those forms in the usage of his times. But it is not understandable how *tāna-* was not used then, while it is of frequent occurrence in *MBhr*.

Obsn 100 : (This may be referred to here for the use of *māṁsa-śīla-*, *māṁsa-kāma-*, *māṁsa-bhakṣa-*, *kalyāṇācāra-*, *sukha-pratīkṣa-* and *kalyāṇa-kṣama-*.)

---

[373] On the *RV tana-* Sāyaṇa is found to explain : *tanoti=iti tanaḥ/pacādy-ac/*(1.39.7) and *tanvanti ...... iti tanāni/*(8.25.2).

[374] See Obsn **91**.

[375] Also in its reconstruction by BIRWE (189).

[376] In fact the *VWC Consolidated Indices* (II. 181) records, as occurring even in the Saṁhitā and Brāhmaṇa texts, *tāna-* preceded by *ā-*, *ud-*, *ni-*, *pra-*, *vi-* and *sam-*.

[377] It is also not attested in literature.

<< 7 >> FORMS IN - *AKA*$_2$ (*ṢVUN*)

(Sūtra : 3. 1. 145)

Obsn 96 : (i) P used forms derived from any root by adding the suffix ***ṣvun*** (*-aka*$_2$) in the case of terms referring to artisans (and by adding the suffix ***ṇvul*** (*-aka*$_1$) in the case of terms for non-artisans). He might have used the forms, ***nartaka-***, ***khanaka-***, ***rañjaka-***(derivable either by *ṣvun* or by ***ṇvul***).

(ii) Kty probably had a similar usage. He used ***rajaka-*** also.

(iii) Unlike P and Kty, only when artisan-denoting forms were derived from ***√nṛt-***, *√khan-* and *√rañj-* (i e. the resultant forms being respectively *nartaka-*, *khanaka-* and *rañjaka-*), Ptj had them with *ṣvun* (*-aka*$_2$) (and with ***ṇvul*** (*-aka*$_1$) in the case of terms for non-artisans). (He also used the form *rajaka-*.) From other roots he derived forms with ***ṇvul***, (without distinction in the two types of meanings), such as ***hvāyaka-*** which particularly was not used by P or Kty.

I

P had laid down the general suffix *ṇvul* by *ṇvul-tṛcau* (3. 1. 133) to get agent-forms ending in *aka*. Being a *ṇ-it* this suffix caused Vṛddhi to the final vowel or to the penultimate *a* (by 7.2.115 f.) and being a *l-it* brought the accent on the syllable preceding the suffix (by 6. 1. 193). Again, the feminine form here would be ending in *ikā*, i. e. in *ā* (*ṭāp* by 4. 1. 4.) preceded by *ika* substituted for *aka* (by 7. 3. 44). — But, he also saw in usage a class of forms that were terms for artisans or denoting some profession, which bore accent on the first syllable and whose feminine ended in *akī*, i. e. in *ī*. So to take care of such forms he introduced most generally (3. 1. 145 *śilpini*[378] *ṣvun*) the suffix *ṣvun* instead of *ṇvul*, which being a *ṣ-it* brought in the fem. suffix (*ṅīṣ* by 4. 1. 41), and being a *n-it* brought the accent on the first syllable (by 6.1.197). —However, it may be noted that, whether related to an artisan or not, in either case, a woman, not expressing the qualities of her male counterpart but merely being his ' wife ', would have a form ending in *ī* (*ṅīṣ* by 4.1.48) and accented on the final syllable (by 3.1.3)

---

[378] On *śilpam* (at 4.4.55), *Ny* and *PdM* (3.762) : *kriyābhyāsa-pūrvako jñānaviśeṣaḥ*, and Kaiy (IV. 234 b) : *abhyāsapūrvakaṁ kriyāsu kauśalam.*

Later, by the time of Ptj, the picture relating to this usage appears to have changed considerably. The distinction of the suffix *ṣvun* (giving guṇated forms and *-akī*-ending feminines) conferred upon a class of terms denoting artisans of all types was restricted then only to terms for three types of artisans derived from the three roots, √*nṛt-* " to dance ", √*khan-* " to dig " and √*rañj-* " to paint ". Forms obtained only from these roots showed the suffix *ṣvun*, to yield terms for artisans. All the other kinds of forms, i.e. forms from the same roots but denoting non-artisans, as well as forms from other roots denoting either artisans or non-artisans, showed only the general suffix *ṇvul*. (*nṛti-khani-rañjibhya iti vaktavyam*, II.92.20.)

The situation can be presented in short thus :

	After Roots	Suffix in a Form Denoting	
		Non-Artisan	Artisan
For P, Kty :	(1) *nṛt-, khan-, rañj-* :	*ṇvul*	*ṣvun*
	(2) other than these :	*ṇvul*	*ṣvun*
For Ptj :	(1) *nṛt-, khan-, rañj-* :	*ṇvul*	*ṣvun*
	(2) other than these :	*ṇvul*	*ṇvul*

The point about his usage is further explained by Ptj by referring negatively (i.e. as not showing *ṣvun*) to a counter-example (*iha* [*ṣvun*] *mā bhūt/hvāyaka* (v.l. *vāyaka*) *iti* [*atra yathā ṇvul eva syāt*] / II.92.20). Thus, from √*hve-* " to call or invoke " with *ṇvul* he had the forms, (uniformly) for " an invoker by profession " (and for " a casual caller ") :-*hvā́yaka-* m., and (1) *hvā́yikā-* f. " fem.counterpart of *hvāyaka-*" and (2) *hvāyakī́-* f. " wife of *hvā́yaka-* ". (Supposing he truly had the other reading [not accepted as such by Kielhorn in his edition], Ptj is to be taken to have had from √*ve-* " to weave " the forms, uniformly for " a weaver " and for " one weaving casually " :- *vā́yaka-* m., and (1) *vā́yikā-* f. "fem. counterpart of *vā́yaka-*" and (2) *vāyakī́-* f. " wife of *vā́yaka-*".) But the implication that P and Kty might have had the *ṣvun*-ending *hvāka-* or *hvākī-* (v.l. *vāka-* or *vākī-*) in their usage cannot be true, as these strange forms are nowhere found attested. It is more likely that the artisan-denoting *hvāyaka-* was a new development of Ptj's time.—Of the specific artisan-denoting forms, showing *ṣvun* with P and Kty and *ṇvul* with Ptj, we have no definite knowledge.

The following would make the historical picture clearer :

NON-ARTISAN	ARTISAN
MASC. **P, Kty** :	
(To ALL roots : *ṇvul.* Accent 6.1.193.)	(To ALL roots : *ṣvun.* Accent : (6.1.197.)
nártaka- "one dancing casually."	*nártaka-* "a dancer."
khā́naka- (7.2 116) "one digging casually." [379]	*khánaka-* "a professional digger (miner)."
ráñjaka- "one painting or washing casually.'	*ráñjaka-* "a painter or washerman."
(*hvā́yaka-* "one calling casually.")	(**hvā́ka-* (6.1.45, 7.3.33) "a professional invoker.")
Ptj :	
(To ALL roots : *ṇvul.* Accent 6.1.193.)	(1) (To ONLY *3* roots : *ṣvun.* Accent : 6.1.197.)
(1) *nártaka-* *khā́naka-* *ráñjaka-*	*nártaka-* *khā́naka-* *ráñjaka-*
(2) *hvā́yaka-*	(2) (To OTHER roots : *ṇvul* Accent: 6.1.193.) *hvā́yaka-*
[**So, P, Kty>Ptj** :— No change.	(i) No change in 3 forms. (ii) Change in form from √*hve-*.]
FEM. **P, Kty** : "female counterpart"	
(To ALL roots: *ṇvul*; + *ṭāp* 4.1.4, 7.3.44. Accent : 3.1.4.)	(To ALL roots : *ṣvun*; + *ṅīṣ* : 4.1.41. Accent : 3.1.3.)
nártikā- *khā́nikā-* *ráñjikā-* (*hvā́yikā-*)	*nartakī́-* *khanakī́-* *rañjakī́-* (**hvākī́-*)
Ptj :	
(To ALL roots:*ṇvul*; + *ṭāp* 4.1.4,'7.3.44. Accent : 3.1.4, 6.1.193.)	(1) (To ONLY *3* roots : *svuṇ*; +*ṅīṣ* 4.1.41. Accent : 3.1.3.)
(1) *nártikā-* *khā́nikā-* *ráñjikā-*	*nartakī́-* *khonakī́-* *rañjakī́-*
(2) *hvā́yikā-*	(2) (To OTHER roots : *ṇvul*; + *ṭāp* 4.1.4, 7.3.44. Accent : 3.1.4, 6.1.1 93) *hvā́yikā-*

---

[379] Probably like one mentioned once by Ptj as *aṅgulyā khanati* (II. 307.14).

NON-ARTISAN	ARTISAN
[So, P, Kty > Ptj : —	
No change.	(i) No change in 3 forms. (ii) Change in form from √*hve*–.]
FEM. P, Kty : "wife".	
(To ALL roots : *ṇvul*; + *ṅīṣ* 4.1.48. Accent : 3.1.3.)	(To ALL roots : *ṣvun*; + *ṅīṣ* 4.1.48. Accent : 3.1.3.)
nartakī́– *khānakī́–* *rañjakī́–* (*hvāyakī́–*)	*nartakī́–* *khanakī́–* *rañjakī́* (**hvākī́–*)
Ptj :	
(To ALL roots : *ṇvul*; + *ṅīṣ* 4.1.48 Accent : 3.1.3.)	(1) (To ONLY *3* roots : *ṣvun*; + *ṅīṣ* 4.1.48. Accent 3.1.3.)
(1) *nartakī́–* *khānakī́–* *rañjakī́–*	*nartakī́–* *khanakī́–* *rañjakī́–*
(2)	(2) (To OTHER roots : *ṇvul*; + *ṇiṣ* 4.1.48. Accent : 3.1.3.)
hvāyakī́–	*hvāyakī́–*
[So, P, Kty > Ptj :—	
No change.	(i) No change in 3 forms. (ii) Change in form from √*hve*.]

And the same is in short thus :

	NON-ARTISAN	ARTISAN
P, Kty :-	(*ṇvul*) (*ṇvul*)	(*ṣvun*) (*ṣvun*)
	nártaka–, *khā́naka–*, *ráñjaka–*, (*hvā́yaka–*)	*nártaka–*, *khánaka–*, *ráñjaka,–* (**hváka–*)
	nártikā–, *khā́nikā–*, *ráñjikā–*, (*hvā́yikā–*)	*nartakī́–*, *khanakī́–*, *rañjkī́–*, (**hvākī́–*)
	nartakī́–, *khānakī́–*, *rañjakī́–*, (*hvāyakī́–*)	*nartakī́–*, *khanakī́–*, *rañjakī́–*, (**hvākī́–*)
Ptj :-	(*ṇvul*) (*ṇvul*)	(*ṣvun*) (*ṇvul*)
	hvā́yaka–	(*hváyaka–*)
	—do— *hvā́yikā–*	—do— (*hváyikā–*)
	hvāyakī́–	(*hvāyakī́–*)

II

On P's Sūtra (6. 4. 24), *aniditāṁ hala upadhāyāḥ kṅiti*, causing loss of the penultimate nasal in the root before a *k-it* or a *ṅ-it* suffix, there are certain initial and final suggestions made in the Vt-s of Kty about certain formations from √*rañj-* ('*rañji*' of 6. 4. 24. 1); and those are naturally followed by Ptj's explanations. One such inital suggestion, wanting to establish the forms *rajaka-* etc., asks for an extra enumeration of those forms on the Sūtra 6. 4. 24, in order to get the *na-lopa* in them. (*rajaka-rajana- rajassu= upasaṁkhyānaṁ kartavyam. rajakaḥ rajanaṁ raja iti.* III. 195.4) This suggestion presupposes derivation of those forms with suffixes other than *k-it* or *ṅ-it*. It is answered by Kty by establishing those forms with certain *k-it* suffixes that would automatically be causing the *na-lopa* by the very rule 6. 4. 24. (6. 4. 24. 5 : ***rajaka- rajana-rajassu kittvāt siddham.***) This final suggestion of Kty is explained by Ptj in the words, *kita evaita auṇādikāḥ* etc. (III. 195.6). That indicates :

(1) that Kty and Ptj used the non-nasalised form *rajaka-* derived from √*rañj-*;

(2) that Kty derived it with a *k-it* suffix; and

(3) that Ptj too derived it with a *k-it* suffix which was one of the Uṇādi group.

What that Uṇādi *k-it* suffix was is given by Kaiy to be ***kvun*** from the Uṇādi rule, *kvun śilpi-saṁjñayor apūrvasyāpi* (2.32)[380]

Now, if this derivation were accepted, √*rañj-* would have to be supposed to be deriving, with ***kvun*** and signifying an artisan and a conventional name, the non-nasalised forms, *rajaka-* "a washerman", *rajikā-* "a washerwoman" and *rajakī-* "a washerman's wife." That means that the two sets , *rañjaka-* etc., and *rañjaka-* etc., earlier derived by Ptj. (II. 92. 20) in the senses of an artisan and a non-artisan respectively, with the addition of *ṣvun* and *ṇvul* respectively, cannot be had by this derivation. This appears to involve a contradiction between the two derivations of Ptj. *SK* (2907) on this rule of P makes a statement on ***nṛti-khani-rañjibhya iti vaktavyam***, that in the opinion of Ptj only two roots, √*nṛt-* and √*khan-* are intended; [381] thereby BhD appears to have held that the form *rañjaka-* was not used or derived by Ptj.

Since a number of points are involved in an examination of the sanction and usage by P, Kty and Ptj of the forms, *rañjaka-* and *rajaka-*, it appears better at this stage to leave the question without arriving at a definite conclusion.

---

[380] According to AUFRECHT's ed. (p. 48); but 3.5, according to Y. MIMAMSAKA's ed. of *Daśapādyuṇādivṛtti* (Benares, 1943).

[381] *'bhāṣya-mate tu nṛti-khanibhyām eva ṣvun'.*

III

In early literature, *nartaka-* is found mentioned in *MBhr,* and *nartakī-* by Īśvarakṛṣṇa round 200 A. D [382] in the *Sāṅkhya-Kārikā* (59) :

raṅgasya darśayitvā nivartate nartakī yathā nṛtyāt /
puruṣasya tathā ' tmānaṁ prakāśya vinivartate prakṛtiḥ //

khanaka- is used in *Rām* and *MBhr,* and *khānaka-* in *VarBS* (89.9). *rajaka-* is used in *MBhr* (12. 92. 2), *rajakī-* in *SāhD.*, and *rajikā-* in *VarBJ rañjaka-* is found in *Manu* (4. 216). *hvāyaka-* is not attested, but *vāyaka-* is found in the classical literature.

As for P, he has in his rules referred to √*nṛt-* twice, √*khan-* or forms from it eight times and √*rañj-* or √*raj-* thrice; so it is likely that he had agent-forms ending in *-aka* derived from those roots. √*rañj-* is once used in a Śl-Vt quoted by Ptj (III. 337. 14). Ptj has used the base *nartakī-* in the forms, *nartakikā-* (III. 158·16), *nartaki-tarā-* and *nartaki-tamā-* (III. 158.14); *khānaka-* in the compound *kūpa-khānaka-* (I. 11. 7); *rajaka-* once in the compound '*rajaka-tantuvāyam*' (I. 475. 8); and *hvāyaka-* also once (III. 30. 5-6) where it is also shown to be a base in √*hvāyakīya-* and √*jihvāyakīyiṣā-*.

---

[382] DASGUPTA, *Philos*, I.212.

<< 8 >> FORMS IN -*AKA*$_3$ (*VUN*)

(Sūtra-s : 3.1.149 f.)

Obsn. 97 : (i) P used *pravaka-*, *saraka-* and *lavaka-* to signify agents repeatedly doing the respective acts, and probably **prāvaka-*, *sāraka-* and *lāvaka-* denoting agents just doing those acts.

(ii) Kty used *pravaka-*, *saraka-* and *lavaka-* to signify agents doing the respective acts in a proper or graceful manner; he probably used the other forms like **prāvaka-* to denote agents not so doing their respective acts.

(iii) Ptj's usage reflected the same usage as that of Kty, but probably strictly so.

P's usage showed the forms, *právaka-* "one who goes away or jumps frequently", *sáraka-* "one who moves constantly" and *lávaka-* "one who cuts often", all in the sense of repeatedly doing the acts signified respectively by √*pru-* "to go or jump ", √*sṛ-* "to move" and √*lū-* " to cut". So he set up the suffix *vun* to appear in that sense after those roots (3. 1. 149 : *pru-sṛ-lvaḥ samabhihāre vun*). (Accent by 6. 1. 197.) By implication, when not wanting to convey the idea of repetition, he used other forms formed with the general suffix *ṇvul*, viz., **prā́vaka-* " one who goes or jumps, " *sā́raka-* " one who moves " and *lā́vaka-* " one who cuts". (Accent by 6. 1. 193.)

By the time of Kty, however, the idea of ' repetition ' earlier present in the three forms noted by P had faded into the background; and it had developed into the idea of ' a skilful way of doing ' the act denoted by the roots at their base. So he sought to alter the rule of P accordingly. (3.1.149.1 : *pru-sṛ-lvaḥ sādhukāriṇi vun-vidhānam.*) Thus, *pravaka-* then meant " one who goes or jumps in a graceful manner ", *saraka-* " one who moves on charmingly " and *lavaka-* " one who cuts with skill ". To denote all other types of doers of the same acts, he probably used **prāvaka-*, *sāraka-* and *lāvaka-* respectively.

The peculiarity of usage noted by Kty had remained in vogue also at the time of Ptj. It was perhaps even keenly maintained then, as Ptj's explanatory statement seems to imply : " (only) one who does the act (expressed in any of the three roots) even once but well would be (strictly) entitled to be called a *pravaka-*, a *saraka-* or a *lavaka-*; not one performing it repeatedly but still in a clumsy or awkward manner". (*sakṛd api yaḥ suṣṭhu karoti tatra yathā syād; bahuśo 'pi yo duṣṭhu karoti tatra mā bhūd iti* : II.93. 3-4).

This then reflects an obvious semantic development. However later commentators beginning from the author of *KV* understand Kty as only 'interpreting' P, and so as saying that the word used in his rule by P for 'repetition' of an act **indicates** 'a good manner of doing' it.[383] And Haradatta explains this further by telling that normally one practising an act repeatedly attains mastery in it in the course of time.[384]

Needless to say that linguistic history of a usage spread over a long in terval as that between P and Kty does not allow us to assume the possibility of what may be only an attainment of physical skill during the life-time of a man.— Again, one indulging in the (Samabhihāra or) repetition of a performance is very similar to (a Tacchīla- or) a person habitually doing an act; and P himself has at one place drawn a distinction between such a person and (a Tatsādhukārin- or) a person doing an act well. (Cp. *ā kves tacchīla-taddharma-tatsādhukāriṣu*, 3.2.134.)[385] That can be a Jñāpaka of P for **not indicating** a good performance by mere repetition of an act. — Further a 'Sādhukārin-' "skilful doer of an act" is very similar to a 'Śilpin-'; and to denote such an agent (Śilpin-), P has already enjoined the suffix *ṣvun* (forming an *īkārānta* feminine form) by the rule, *śilpini ṣvun* (3.1.145). That is another indication (Jñāpaka) that P wanted to distinguish (1) the present *aka-* ending (and *ākārānta* feminine) forms with stress on doing an act with Samabhihāra or repetition, from (2) the previous *aka-* ending (and *īkārānta* feminine) forms with stress on doing an act with Śilpa or skill. — Kty, above all, himself refers at another place to a good performer as being different from a habitual doer (which last a repeated doer can be). (Cp. on P's *supy ajātau ṇinis tācchīlye*, 3.2.78, Kty's Vt 1 : *ṇin-vidhau sādhukāriṇy upasaṁkhyānam.*) — Lastly, Ptj's words (quoted above) do not even smell an intrepretation of (the Samabhihāra sense of) P indicating the idea of (the Sādhukāritā sense of) Kty.

The two sets of forms were, therefore, too clear and expressive for P to enter into the distinct spheres of eachother within a short period of habit-formation; and only a long passage of time, as that between Kty and Ptj, can be assumed to account for the linguistic development in their expressiveness.

---

[383] *'samabhihāra'-grahaṇenātra sādhukāritvaṁ lakṣyate, KV* 169.

[384] *PdM* 538 : *yaś ca yāṁ kriyāṁ punaḥpunar anutiṣṭhati tasya tatra prāyeṇa kauśalam upajāyate, ataḥ prāyaḥsāhacaryāt sādhukāritvaṁ lakṣyate lakṣaṇatayā tatra vartata ity arthaḥ;* see also *TattvaB* on *SK* 2911 : *bhūyaḥ-sahacārād yo hi kriyāṁ punaḥpunar anubhavati sa tatra prāyeṇa kauśalaṁ labhate;* and *GRM* (p. 6.1.4) *abhyāso hi karmaṇāṁ kauśalam āvahati.*

[385] See also *TattvaB* on *SK* 2988(3.2.78) : *'ā kveḥ' iti sūtre hi tacchīlāt pṛthak sādhukārī gṛhyate,* and *KV* (190) on 3.2.134 : *tacchīlo yaḥ svabhāvataḥ phalanirapekṣas tatra pravartate; vinā 'pi śīlena tatsādhukārī yo dhātvarthaṁ sādhu karoti.*

In literature, the forms *pravaka-*, *saraka-* and *lavaka-* are not attested. Also, of the alternative forms corresponding to the other contexts, only *lāvaka-* is found used and frequently so by Ptj in *M*. Even of the possible *l*-alternants, only *plavaka-* is attested in *MBhr* (13.24.16).

<< 9 >> FORMS IN A_5 (*AṆ*)

(Sūtra-s : 3.2.1 f., 44)

Obsn 98 : (i) P used Karmopapada-compound forms ending in an *aṇ-anta* Kṛdanta, in general.

(ii) A contemporary or predecessor of Kty probably had these restricted in his dialect to forms wherein the Upapada was **only** either a 'producible' or a 'mutable' object, **not** where it was an 'obtainable' object.

(iii) Kty had such forms, with Upapada-s being not only the 'producible' or 'mutable' objects, but plenty of times being the 'obtainable' object also. A classified enumeration of this last type of objects is first attempted by Kty, but later left up in view of their large number in the usage.— There were in his usage only some **few** cases when the 'obtainable' object could not be compounded with a Kṛdanta ending in *aṇ*.

(iv) The usage of Ptj was the same as that of Kty. He supplies instances of that. The few instances when such compounding was not possible when the Upapada was an 'obtainable' object are also supplied by him.

P detected a large number of compound-forms in his usage, bearing the suffix *aṇ* after roots having an object as the Upapada. So he laid down a general rule (*karmaṇy aṇ*, 3.2.1) to establish them and probably also to sanction new formations of the type.

From a long discussion by Kty (to which he devotes not less than five Vt-s) on the view of his predecessors or contemporaries, it appears there was then current a usage according to which the 'obtainable' or 'attainable' (*prāpya*) type of objects were prohibited from being used as Upapada-s in compounds with Kṛdanta-s ending in *aṇ*.[386] There was no objection to the use in such compounds of the other two of the three types of objects[387], the 'producible' (*nirvartyamāna*) and the 'mutable' (*vikriyamāṇa*).

---

[386] Whether, by this view, (1) compounding of the Prāpyakarmopapada-s with Kṛdanta-s **ending only in the suffix** aṇ was not acceptable, or whether (2) their compounding with forms **ending in any of the Kṛt suffixes** was not acceptable,— is not clear. Even the (—unattested—) form *grāma-gamin-*, once occurring in *M* (I.383.3), is not considered to be an Upapada-compound (—which is a Nitya-samāsa by 2.2.19—) with a Kṛdanta ending in *ṇini* (or *-in*) by 3.2.78, but an Accusative type of the Determinative Compound (Dvitīyā-tatpuruṣa) by Ptj there (I. 383.3),—firstly probably on the strength of P mentioning it as an independent form in the rule, *bhaviṣyati gamy-ādayaḥ* (3.3.3), and secondly on the strength of the Vt, *śritādiṣu gami-gāmy-ādīnām upasaṁkhyānam* (2.1.24.1).

Kty points out the 'incorrectness' in the above observation by starting to inform cases of 'attainable' objects that **did** show in usage the Upapada-compounds ending in *aṇ* and as such that needed to be added to the above restrictive usage.

First he cites forms, 'like *vedādhyāya-*'.[388] (3.2.1.1 : *karmaṇi nirvartyamāna-vikriyamāṇe ced vedādhyāyādīnām upasaṁkhyānam*). These other forms, 'similar' to *vedādhyāya-* "one studying the Veda", as supposed by Ptj to be intended by Kty, are *carcā-pāra-* "one who has completed or mastered the *carcā* (mode of recitation)" and *śamanī-pāra-* "one who has completed or mastered the *śamanī* (mode)." (The forms *carcā-* and *śamanī-* are not found used by P or Kty. — Now, the '*ādi*' "like" from '*vedādhyāyādi*' can cover all sorts of 'attainable' type of objects that could be so compounded; still Kty goes on in the next two Vt-s to cite some classes of forms that showed this type of objects as the Upapada which is said to be just to amplify the point made in the first Vt.[389]

So next, a type of forms with a Prāpyakarmopapada wherein the agent is entrusted with some duty are added by Kty for being governed by the present rule of P (3.2.1.2: *yatra ca niyuktaḥ*). These are, as supplied by Ptj, *chatra-dhāra-* "holder of the parasol" and *dvāra-pāla-* "protecting (i. e. keeping at) the door, a door-keeper". (*chatra-* and *dvāra-* are found used by P: 4.4.62, 4.3.86, 7.3.4.)

Further, Kty adds, in general, forms ending in the Kṛdanta-s from √*hṛ-*, √*grah-*, √*nī-* √*vah-* (i. e. those ending in *hāra-*, *grāha-*, *nāya-* and *vāha-*,[390] respectively) to the above list (3.2.1.3: *hṛ-grahi-nī-vahibhyaś ca*). These, as illustrated by Ptj, are *bhāra-hāra-*[391] "carrying a burden"

---

[387] Cp. *Vākyapadīya* (3.7.45) :

nirvartyaṁ ca vikāryaṁ ca prāpyaṁ ceti tridhā matam /
tatrepsitatamaṁ karma caturdhā 'nyat tu kalpitam //

I owe this reference to V. P. LIMAYE.

[388] The Veda, being eternal, cannot be either a 'producible' or a 'mutable' object, according to Kaiy (156b).

[389] See NBh (156a) : *vastutaḥ prapañcārtham evaitāni=iti bodhyam.*

[390] The *VWC Consolidated Indices* (II) is found to record a number of forms ending in *hāra-* AP. 300), *grāha-* (378), *nāya-* (234f.) and *vāha-* (378); and it is suspected that many of these may be showing a Karmopapada and the agent sense.

[391] The *bhārāhāra-* supplied by *KV* (171) as a counter-(*a-tācchilya-*) example on P's *āṅi tācchīlye* 3.2.11), can also be an illustration of the present Prāpyakarmopapada type of forms of Kty, though it is not attested in literature.

kamaṇḍalu-grāha- "holding a water-jar", *uṣṭra-praṇāya-*[392] "leading a camel"[393] and *bhāra-vāha-* "carrying a burden". (*kamaṇḍalu-*, *bhāra-* and *uṣṭra-* have been found recorded by P: 41.71, 5.1.50, 4.2.39 etc.)

Finally, Kty, leaves the attempt at suggesting addition of the cases of forms containing *prāpya* objects to the types of *Karmopapada* forms to which the Pūrvapn had his usage confined. As only exceptional cases can normally be enumerated and not forms that are abundant in usage, Kty states that it was no use attempting to enumerate them (3.2.1.4: *a-parigaṇanaṁ vā*), implying thereby that compounding with *prāpya* objects was, in general, quite possible in his usage.

But then, what of some other *prāpya* objects that were actually **not** compounded with Kṛdanta-s ending in *aṇ*? Instances of sentences from which compounding was not possible are supplied by Ptj. These are *ādityaṁ paśyati* "(he, she or it) looks at the sun", *himavantaṁ śṛṇoti* "...... hears about the (mountain) Himālaya" and *grāmaṁ gacchati* "...... goes to a villagè" (II. 94.2-3, 13-14; I. 445.19-20); these could not be transformed respectively into the adjectives like **āditya-darśa-*, **himavac-chrāva-*and **grāma--gāma-*. The reason of Kty for this is '(just) absence of usage (in their particular case)' (3.2.1.5: *anabhidhānāt*).[393a] These are also not attested in literature.

The implication of the above discussion is either (1) that the Pūrvapn simply failed for some reason to take note of forms containing a Prāpyakarmopapada although these existed in his usage (cf. *himavat-* with P: 4.4.112), or (2) that he hailed from a period or a locality (—as distinct from Kty's —) where these forms were **not** in vogue. The preponderence of such forms that was detected in the usage by Kty, so much so that he finally stopped to enumerate them, favours the second implication : the usage, hampered for some reason with the Pūrvapn, showed its richness with Kty. This is in spite of the fact that the Pūrvapn might have been familiar with the stray examples of forms occurring in early literature (noted below), though not found in his usage.

As for Ptj, the absence of a single dissenting or modifying note from him, and the fact of his illustrating Kty's observations with full approval, point to the retention of Kty's usage in his times.

Of the forms noted above, *vedādhyāya-* is found to occur twice in the *ĀDhSū* (1. 24. 6, 2.8. 5),[394] only *carcā*° in the sense of 'repetition (of a word" in two contexts in *M* (*carcā-pada-* I.11.22, 12. 25: *carcā-guṇa-* II. 367. 8-9), *chatra-dhāra-* in *Rām* ´ only at vol.2, 987* l. 3, after 3. 50. 1), *dvāra-pāla-* often in *MBhr*, *bhāra-hāra-* in a stanza quoted in *Nir* (1.18) (also found at *ŚāĀr* 14.2) and *bhāra-vāha-* in a v. l. in *MBhr* (on 3. 133.1). *kamaṇḍalu-grāha-* and *uṣṭra-praṇāya-* are not attested in literature.

---

[392] On the needless use of *pra-*, see for similar cases our remarks at **30**, *apalāpya-*, **31**, *avadābhya-*, **81**, *śyenottha-* etc. and **100**. *sukha-pratīkṣa-*.

[393] Ptj's *grāma-ṇāya-* (Obsn **107**) can also be an instance of the same.

[393a] See CARDONA, *JOI* (1972) 22.230.

[394] Explained by Haradatta as *adhīta-vedaḥ* (p. 164) and *sāṅgasya vedasya=adhyetā* (p. 252) respectively in his commentary *Ujjvalā*.

The *Karmopapda*-compounds ending in *hāra-*, *grāha-*, *nāya-* or *vāha-*, even different from or in addition to those illustrated in *M*, that are found in early literature are only *dharma-vāha-* in *MBhr* (13. 143.42), *chāyā-grāhī-* in a v. l. in *Rām* (on 4. 40. 26) and *kṣīra-hārī-* in *MārkP* (51.35).

Obsn 99 : (i) Nothing is known whether the usages of P and/or Kty contained the Upapada- compound forms, *odana-pāca-*, *kāṣṭha-bheda-*, *artha-jña-*, *kuḍya-lepa-* and *vaḍavā-saṁdāya-*, and the Ṣaṣṭhī-tatpuruṣa compound forms like **odana-paca-*, **kāṣṭha-bhida-*, **artha-jña-*, **kuḍya-limpa-* and **vaḍavā-saṁda-*.

(ii) The Upapada-compound forms noted above were current in the usage of Ptj but there is no evidence about the existence in his usage of the Ṣaṣṭhī-tatpuruṣa campound forms noted above.

Kty has laid down that in all cases of conflict between the two simultaneously occurring *a* suffixes, viz. the one attached to an *anupapada* root (or the '*anupapada akāra*' such as *ac* by 3. 1. 134) and the other attached to a a *karmopapada-* root (or the '*karmopapada akāra*' such as *aṇ* by 3. 2. 1), it is the operation of 'the latter' (i. e. the *karmopapada* suffix *a* which is enjoined later) that alone is to be accepted or is sanctioned on the strength of P's general dictum about resolving a conflict due to co-occurrence (1. 4. 2 : *vipratiṣedhe 'paraṁ' kāryam*). Kty's Vt stating this is : *akārād anupapadāt karmopapado, vipratiṣedhena* (3. 2. 1. 6.) [395] (— We cannot, however, be definite that the dictum was intended to be applied by P himself in this context)

This means that

as, e. g. , (i) from *pacati*, the *anup*⁰ √*pac-* gets *ac* (3. 1. 134) and gives the form *paca-*, and

(ii) from *kumbhaṁ karoti.* the *karmop*⁰ √*kṛ-* gets *aṇ* (3. 2. 1) and gives the form *kumbha-kāra-*,

so, a conflict can occur as,

---

[395] It may be noted that the Vt has a modest intention to cover only one type of Vipratiṣedha (stated above).

Its scope does not relate

either to (1) a *vipra*⁰ between the *anup*⁰ *akāra* and any *sopapada akāra* other than the *karmopapada* one), **or to** (2) a *vipra*⁰ between **any** *anup*⁰ suffix (other than *a*) and **any** *karmopapada* suffix (other than *a*).

e. g. (i) from *odanaṁ 'pacati'*, (the *anup*^{0}) √*pac–* may get *ac* and give the form **odanapaca–*, and

(ii) from '*odanaṁ pacati*', (the *karmop*^{0}) √*pac–* may also get *aṇ* and give the form *odana–pāca–*.

In such a situation, which is a case of conflict between the two simultaneously operating *a* suffixes (viz. *ac* or the so–called '*anupapada a*', and *aṇ* or the '*karmopapada a*'), Kty has given the ruling that it is the latter suffix (i. e. here *aṇ* enjoined by 3. 2. 1) that is to be accepted. To explain further in '*odanaṁ pacati*' it is not √*pac–* that is supposed to get the Kṛt suffix but the *karmopapada*–root √*pac–*, or rather *odana–* √*pac–*, [396] that is supposed to get the Kṛt suffix. [397] Hence it is that in the present example the root, or rather the compound–root, gets the suffix *aṇ* meant for a *karmopapada*–root, and the form results as the Upapada–compound *odana–pāca–* "one who cooks rice. ––Only when in *odanaṁ 'pacati' odana–* were supposed to be not immediately connected with √*pac–*, [398] (1) the bare or *anup*^{0} root √*pac–* would be getting the Kṛt suffix *ac* and (2) the object *odanam* would be changed to the objective genitive *odanasya*; and then, from *odanasya* [399] *pacaḥ*, would be getting the Saṣṭhi– tatpuruṣa compound **odana–paca–*[400] " a cooker of rice ", where the compounding is made optional by P by his general rule *vibhāṣā* (2.1.11).

---

[396] Compounding by *upapadam atiṅ* (2.2.19) (not by *gatikārakopapadānāṁ kṛdbhiḥ saha samāsavacanam*, 4.1.48.4), 2.1.1 and 2.4.71. See Ptj I.417.18-21 on 2.2.19.

[397] This may be according to the *Vākyasaṁskāra-pakṣa*. See fn. 400-(b).

[398] This may be according to the *Padasaṁskāra-pakṣa*. See fn. 400-(d).

[399] Which is called a '*kṛdyogā ṣaṣṭhī*' i.e. (a form in) the Ṣaṣṭhī related with a Kṛdanta. A *kṛ*^{0} *ṣa*^{0} may be either objective (as here) or subjective; i.e. the word in the genitive case may be respectively either the object or the subject of the action denoted by the root in the related Kṛdanta. This *kṛ*^{0} *ṣa*^{0} is made possible by P's rule, *kartṛ-karmaṇoḥ kṛti* (*ṣaṣṭhī*) (2.3.65). Compounding of a form in this *kṛ*^{0} *ṣa*^{0} with its related Kṛdanta is made possible by the Vt of Kty, *kṛdyogā ca* (2.2.8.1), on the Sūtra, *ṣaṣṭhī* (2.2.8).

[400] (a) Such forms may be perhaps established according to *Ny* with *ac* by the easy way of including them in the *pacādi-gaṇa* which is an Ākṛti-gaṇa. (*ākṛtigaṇatve cāsya, cakradhara=ādayaḥ siddhā bhavanti*, 529.) But what of forms showing a suffix other than *ac* ?

(b) Haradatta, however, favouring probably the *Vākyasaṁskāra-pakṣa* (cp. *ekatvāt prayogasya, PdM* 543), would not sanction forms like **odana-paca-*. But he would accept forms like *gaṅgā-dhara-*, *śrī-dhara-*, *vajra-dhara-*, *bhū-dhara-* and *srag-dhara-*, those being conventional names.

(c) This has been answered by BhD in *SK* (p. 490f.) and much elaborately in *ŚabK* (II.427) by resorting rather to the residual (objective) function of the genitive case (*karmaṇaḥ śeṣatva-vivakṣā*). He, thus, would like to sanction forms like **odanapaca-*; and, if at all they were to be denied sanction, he would, in that case, rather like to resort to the 'Anabhidhāna' ("non-currency or non-usage of the theoretical or grammatically possible forms").

(d) *TattvaB* (491) finds such forms justifiable according to the *Padasaṁskāra-pakṣa* (like *Ny*).

It will thus be seen that the benefit derived from Kty's ruling is that the compound resulting from it is made **obligatory**, as it is an Upapada-compound which is a Nitya-samāsa by P 's rule (2.2.19), *upapadam atiṅ* (' *nityam*' 17 *samasyate* or *samāsaḥ* 2.1.3). On the contrary, the other type of compound ceases to be an Upapada-compound, becomes a genitive compound (by *ṣaṣṭhī* 2.2 8), and is made **optional** by the general rule of P to that effect(*vibhāṣā* 2.1.11). That means, e. g., that *odana-pāca-* would be an obligatory compound and one of the first type, while **odana-paca-* would be an optional compound and one of the second type.

Other such cases, as recorded by Ptj , are : –

2. *kāṣṭha-bheda-* " one who cuts wood " (an obligatory, with *aṇ* : as against the possible and optional,
**kāṣṭha-bhida-* " a cutter of wood " with *ka* by 3.1.135);
3. *artha-jña-* " one who understands the sense, expert or experienced in a matter" (obligatory, with *ka* by 3.2.3 : as against the possible and optional,
**artha-jña-* " a knower of the sense ", with *ka* by 3.1 135);
4. *kuḍya-lepa-* " one who plasters the wall " (obligatory with *aṇ* : as against the possible and optional,
**kuḍya-limpa-* " a plasterer of the wall ", with *śa* by 3.1.138); and
5. *vaḍavā-saṁdāya-* " one who gives a mare " (obligatory with *aṇ*: as against the possible and optional,
**vaḍavā-saṁda-* " giver of a mare " with *ka* by 3.1. 136).

The above should suggest that (Kty and) Ptj might have had in the mind (and hence be having a veiled reference to) the other set of optional counter-formations which were the Ṣaṣṭhī-tatpuruṣa compounds, viz. **odana-paca-* etc.; but evidence is wanting to be sure on the point.

Of the five Upapada-compound forms noted by Ptj, it cannot be said if any was known to P or Kty; Ptj too uses them only once. In lierature only *artha-jña-* is found used for which see Obsn **89.** The rest are unattested.[400a] (— Among the Upapada-s, *kuḍya-* is neither found with P or Kty nor in the Veda, *odana-* is found with P at 4.4.67 and with Kty at 1.1 67.2, and *kāṣṭha-* (8.1.67.1, 8.2.22.2) and *vaḍavā-* (2.4.12.3 , 2.4.26.3) only with Kty.)

[400a] *kāṣṭhabheda-* is perhaps anticipated in the lines, *aruṣó ná vājī́ kā́ṣṭhā bhindán* (*RV* 4.58.7) and *atha me 'bhūt śiroduḥkhaṁ vane kāṣṭhāni bhindataḥ* (*MBhr* 3.282.30). See V. P. LIMAYE, *CSM*, p. 190f.

Obsn 100 : (i) Perhaps P used the Upapada-compound forms ending in the following pairs of masc. and fem. forms : **śīlá–, *śīlī́–; *kāmá–, *kāmī́–; *bhakṣá–, *bhakṣī́–; *ācārá–, *ācārī́–;*īkṣá–, *īkṣī́–;* and **kṣamá–, *kṣamī́–.*

(ii) Kty used the Upapada-compound forms ending in the following pairs of (unaccented) masc. and fem. forms respectively against those listed above : *śīla–, śīlā–; kāma–, kāmā–; bhakṣa–, bhakṣā–; ācāra–, ācārā–; īkṣa–, īkṣā–;* and *kṣama–, kṣamā–.*

(iii) Ptj retained the usage of Kty and actually used the following pairs of compound-forms corresponding to those of Kty: *māṁsá–śīla–, °lā–; māṁsá–kāma–, °mā–; māṁsá–bhakṣa–, °kṣā–; kalyā́ṇācāra–, °rā–; sukhá–pratīkṣa–, °kṣā;* and *kalyā́ṇa-kṣama–, °mā–.* (He had few or no forms ending in bare *īkṣa*(*ā*)–.)

I

P had laid down a general rule that roots having the Karmopapada-s should form Upapada-compounds with them by taking the Kṛt–suffix *aṇ* (3.2.1: *karmaṇy aṇ*). — It is likely and not impossible that P's usage contained Karmopapada-compound forms ending in Kṛdanta–s from any of the roots like *√śīl–, √kam–, √bhakṣ–, ā– √car–, √īkṣ–* and *√kṣam–*. If it did, then: (1) the accent must have fallen in the second (i.e. Kṛdanta) member of the Upapada-compound (by 6.2.139) and on the final syallable (by 3.1.3); and (2) the suffix at the end of the Kṛdanta being *aṇ* by his general rule (3.2.1), the feminine form of the compound must have been *īkārānta* (by his rule 4.1.15 for *ṅīp*). That means that the compounds with these Kṛdanta–s must have ended in *śīlá*- and *śīlī́*–[401] "one who is intensely devoted (i.e. habituated) to", *kāmá–* and *kāmī́–* "one who desires (or is fond of)", *bhakṣá–* and *bhakṣī́–* "one who eats", *ācārá–* and *ācārī́–*, "one who acts or practises", *īkṣá–* and *īkṣī́–* "one who looks for," and *kṣamá–* [402] and *kṣamī́–* "one who is capable of".

By the time of Kty, however, (1′) the accent in the above compounds was found to be on their first members; and, further, (2′) the feminine forms in all these cases had been *ākārānta*.. So he introduced two Vārttika–s recording these facts relevant to Kṛdanta–s derived only from the above-mentioned roots (3.2.1.7:*śīli–kāmi-bhakṣy–ācaribhyo ṇah pūrvapadaprakṛtisvaratvaṁ*

---

[401] The accent in the fem. is brought by the rules, 3.1.4, 6.4.148 and 6.1.161.

[402] The Vṛddhi brought in by a *ṇ-it* suffix (7.2.116) is here prohibited by 7.3.34.

ca; 3. 2. 1. 8: *īkṣi-kṣamibhyāṁ ca*).[403] (1′) To note the accent that appeared different from the one seen by P's rule about Upapada-compounds, he introduced '*pūrvapadaprakṛtisvaratvam*'; and (2′) to get the feminine ending *ā* (i. e. *ṭāp* by 4.1.4), he introduced the *karmopapada* suffix *ṇa* instead of the *aṇ* enjoined by P. (See : *kimartham idam ucyate ? pūrvapadaprakṛtisvaratvaṁ ca vakṣyāmi, īkāraś ca mā bhūd iti.* II. 95.24.)

The same usage continued to prevail at the time of Ptj. He has illustrated it with actual instances from his speech, viz. *māṁsá-śīla-*[404] and °*lā-* "one accustomed to (eating) flesh", *māṁsá-kāma-* and °*mā-* " desirous or fond of flesh ", *māṁsá-bhakṣa-* and °*kṣā-* " eating flesh", *kalyāṇācāra-*[405] and °*rā-* " performing good deeds" or " following good practices", *sukhá- pratīkṣa-* and°*kṣā-* "looking for or expecting happiness", and *kalyāṇa-kṣama-* and °*mā-* "capable of doing good". — It may be noted in passing that a form with a Kṛdanta from √*īkṣ-* is illustrated by Ptj not by one in √*īkṣ-* (i. e. *īkṣa-*) but by one in *prati-* √*īkṣ-* (i. e. *pratīkṣa-*); this may suggest that Ptj had difficulty in finding a form in √*īkṣ-*, and the reason may be that forms from *anupasarga* √*īkṣ-* were not of common occurrence in his usage.[406] Then, of the three Upapada-s, *māṁsa-* is used by Kty only once, but *sukha-* often.

II

An objection was raised on the Vt of Kty that the forms wanted to be established by him could as well be got even by the rules of P if the forms were understood to be Bahuvrīhi compounds, when (1″) the accent would be falling on the first member (by the general rule, 6. 2. 1), and (2″) the compound could be getting the fem. suffix *ā* (by 4. 1. 4) if the second member were supposed to be a Kṛdanta ending not in *ṇ* (by 3. 3. 1. 7) but in some such suffix like *ac* (by 3. 3. 56) (as in *bhakṣa-* from the ' Bahuvrīhi ' *māṁsa-bhakṣa-*),[407] *ghañ* (by 3. 3. 19) etc.

To this the reply of Ptj is embodied in the following suggestion[408] :-

---

[403] Composition of a different Vārttika (no. 8) for forms derived from √*īkṣ-* and √*kṣam-*, apparently with no purpose, is said to be merely for the sake of 'variety'. (Cf. *PdM* (542) : *vākya-bhedas tu vaicitryārthaḥ.*)—However, could the apparent absurdity be resolved by understanding the use of '*ca*' in Vt 8 as significant (rather than as purposeless) ? On this interpretation, '*ca*' would suggest : (1) development of a new usage (recorded in Vt 7) beside (2) retention of the earlier P's) usage as well (— for which reason, forms of Vt 8 were separated from those of Vt 7) which, however, was not to be seen with Ptj.

[404] *māṁsá-* is derived from √*man-* and the suffix *sa*, by *USū*, *maner dīrghaś ca* (3.64), and accented on *sa* by 3.1.3 of P.

[405] *kalyáṇa-* is so accented by the *PhiṭSūtra* (42), *laghāv ante dvayoś ca bahvaṣo guruḥ.*

[406] See for similar cases our remarks at **30.** *apalāpya-*, **31.** *avadābhya-*, **81.** *śyenottha-* etc. and **98.** *uṣṭra-praṇāya-*.

[407] *iha yo māṁsaṁ bhakṣayati māṁsaṁ tasya bhakṣo bhavati. yo 'sau bhakṣayater ac tadantena bahuvrīhiḥ.* II. 95.25f.

[408] See : '*evaṁ tarhi siddhe sati yat karmopapadaṁ ṇaṁ śāsti, taj jñāpayatv*(v.l.y) *ācāryaḥ "samāne 'rthe kevalaṁ vigraha-bhedād yatra karmopapadaś ca prāpnoti bahuvrīhiś ca, karmopapadas tatra bhavati="* *iti*'. II.95.26-96.2.

"Inasmuch as,' thus,—even when the usage could be (satisfactorily) established (by other rules of P as pointed out)- (Kty) enjoins the *karmopapada ṇa* (plus [409] the *pūrvapadaprakṛtisvaratva* in an Upapada-compound),

(I understand that) the sage (Kty) strongly implies or recommends (*jñāpayati*) that :

' Where,

(a) with the same ' end ' (i. e. the same usage) being accomplished (or established),

(b) merely due to difference in word-dissolving, ' there can occur simultaneously ' (i.e. it can be suspected that the compounding shows simultaneously) :

(1) the *karmop*° (*ṇa*, plus [409] the *pūrvapada*° in an Upapada-compound) as well as

(2) (a *nirupapada* suffix other than *ṇa* and) the Bahuvrīhi (compound that brings in the *pūrvapada*°),

in that case,

there shall take place i.e. be understood (the first alternative viz.)

the *karmop*° (*ṇa* plus[409] the *pūrvapada*°)

(in preference to the second alternative). ' "

In illustration, Ptj cites (besides silenltly accepting the Pūrvapn example of *māṁsa-bhakṣa-*) the case of *māṁsa-kāma-*, as satisfying the conditions laid down in the Jñāpana and hence providing scope for its working. On this instance, other forms established in the Vārttika of Kty could also be covered by the Jñāpana, and thus all of them are to be looked upon only as Upapada-compounds. Ptj discusses some other possible cases also which are, however, shown to be falling outside the scope of the Jñāpana.[410]

---

[409] This is understood though not referred to again by Ptj.

[410] (i) There was no scope at all for the Jñāpaka in the form *kāṇḍa-lāva-*, as one basic condition viz. **possibility** of having the Vigraha as a Bahuvrīhi (*'kāṇḍāni lāvo 'syeti'*) was not satisfied in it (*'vigrahābhāvāt'*); for : (the unattested) **lāva-* was an impossible form unless derived from a *prakṛtārtha-ṇijanta* root (a very general or indiscreet recourse to which device was not advisable, as pointed out by NBh 159a); and further, *lava-* would give the Bahuvrīhi as **kāṇḍa-lava-* that was (an Anabhidhāna or one not in usage) and would not give the same form as *kāṇḍa-lāva-* to satisfy another basic condition of the Jñāpaka- (viz. aiming at accomplishing the **same** form).

(ii) The Bahuvrīhi was (definitely) seen (in *māṁsa-kāma-ka-* and) possibly in (its alternant :) *māṁsa-kāma-* which, however, is to be looked upon only as an Upapada-compound being so enjoined by the Jñāpaka.

(iii) The basic condition of the Jñāpaka, of getting the same form (*'samāna artha'*) both ways, was not satisfied in *ambhobhigāmī-* where the fem. Bahuvrīhi-form would be **ambhobhigamā-* that had no existence in the usage (Anabhidhāna).

From Ptj's wording of the Jñapana, and much more from his discussion on it citing the usages (Prayojana-s) in order to illustrate where this rule may appear to apply (viz. among others, *kāṇḍa-lāva-* and *ambho'bhigāmī-* that are **additional** to those established by Kty),— it seems that Ptj intended the Jñāpana to be a **general** one, i.e. covering all the cases falling within the scope or conditions laid down and implied in the Jñāpana, and **not just** those that were established in the Vt of Kty.

Now, if P too had derived as a Bahuvrīhi compound (not only any of the above six forms but) any possible form that could end in *śīla-*, *śīlā-*, etc. (as mentioned in the Vt of Kty,) then there would have been no need for Kty's Vt that sought to establish the **same** object in other manner. The very fact that Kty was led to draft the Vt, i.e., we may say the '*Vacana-* (or *Vidhāna-*) *sāmarthya*' of the Vt, proves this.

III

The preceding discussion leads to the following conclusions:

(1) that P did **not** use compounds ending in *śīla-*, *śīlā-* etc. as Bahuvrīhi compounds;

(2) that P used only Upapada-compounds ending in *śīlá- śīlī-*, etc.;

(3) that at Kty's time the forms ending in *śīla-*, *śīlā-* etc. were used and were looked upon only as Upapada-compounds, but that, not conforming to the rules of P, they needed a special Vt-statement to establish them;

(4) that at the time of Ptj a tendency had developed to treat the six particular forms as Bahuvrīhi compounds (and perhaps many more so); and

(5) that a near-predecessor of Ptj and Ptj himself stood in strong opposition to this tendency.

Of the six forms only *māṁsa-bhakṣa-* is attested early in *Hariv* 3.49.9 (p.59. a) = Cri. Ed. App. I, No. 42B, line 78. The rest are unattested.

Obsn 101 : (i) It is not known whether P and/or Kty used the forms, *ambho-'bhigāma-* and *⁰gāmī-*.

(ii) A successor of Kty probably noted some of his contemporaries using the forms, **ambho-' bhigama-* and **⁰gamā-* expressing the same idea. However, he disapproved that usage and favoured the use of only *⁰gāma-* and *⁰gāmī-*.

(iii) Ptj's usage agreed with that of Kty's successor.

Ptj has quoted a 'Vt' of a scholar "*na tv ambhobhigamā.*" This scholar must have flourished after Kty as Kty seems to be ignorant of the point in the 'Vt'. The 'Vt' rejects the formation (**ambho-' bhigama-* and its fem.)

*°*gamā*–, showing a Bahuvrīhi compound. (Cp. Ptj *na tv idaṁ bhavati " ambho 'bhigamo' syā" iti,* II 96.6.) This is in spite of the fact that independently *abhigama*– in the objective sense of "an object to be approached or visited" can be derived with the objective suffix *ap* by P's rule, *graha–vṛ–dṛ–niści–gamaś ca* (3.3.58).

The form favoured in the usage (as suggested by the ' Vt ' and expressed by Ptj) was only (the Upapada–compound,) *ambho–' bhigāma*– and its feminine °*gāmī*– "a (woman) proceeding to the water." (Cp. Ptj : " *ambho–' bhigāmī* " =*ty eva bhavati,* II.96.6–7.) This is regularly had by applying the suffix *aṇ* to *abhi*– √*gam*– preceded by the Karmopapada *ambhas*– (by *karmaṇy aṇ*, 3.2.1).

Now, the special negative instruction contained in the ' Vt ' against the use of **ambho–' bhigamā*– bears a strong suggestion that there were actually some contemporaries of that Vārttika-kāra who constructed and used such a (Bahuvrīhi) form;[411] the ' Vt ' points out that this was against the Śiṣṭa-prayoga.

Nothing can be said whether P or Kty had the forms, *ambho–' bhigāma*– and °*gāmī*–, in the usage of their times.

The forms are not attested in literature.

Obsn 102 : P, Kty and Ptj, all, had the forms, *annāda*– (masc.) and *annādī*– (fem.) in their usage.

P has stated that, in the secular language, √*ad*– when in composition with a case–inflected word other than '*anna*–' took the zero–suffix *viṭ* and resulted in *ad*– as in *āmād*– "eating raw (flesh)" (*ado 'n–anne,* 3. 2. 68); he thereby implied that, with '*anna*–' as the (Karma=)Upapada, √*ad*– took the general suffix *aṇ* (3. 2. 1.) and resulted in *āda*– "one who eats". He, thus, probably used the forms, *annāda*– (m,) and *annādī* (f.)[412] "one eating food", as the second member.

Kty too probably used the same forms, deriving them the same way. This is inferred from his note occurring finally on *karmaṇy aṇ* (3. 2. 1.) and referring to diversity or variation in the use of suffixes observed by him in the Vedic forms, *annādāya* (dative sg. of *annāda*–) etc. (3. 2. 1. 9 : *annādāya=iti*

---

[411] The basis for this temptation seems further to be the form, *abhigama*-, that was not only established by grammar but was probably **actually** current in the contemporary usage. (It also occurs in the *anuśatikādi-gaṇa* mentioned in the rule, 7.3.20.) Hence the tendency to utilise it in a Bahuvrīhi with *ambhas*- as the first member; and it was just this tendency that was disapproved in the Vt. — The case was different with **lāva*-. (See Obsn **100,** fn. 410-(i) and Obsn **106.**) Although *kāṇḍa-lāva*- was accepted in the usage, it was its Vigraha as a Bahuvrīhi (—i.e. the form **lāva*- contained in the Vigraha —) that was not acceptable. — In the former, the components were accepted but not their compounding as a Bahuvrīhi; in the latter, the compound-form was accepted but not the components as obtained from its dissolution as a Bahuvrīhi.

[412] With *ṅīp* added by 4.1.15.

ca kṛtāṁ vyatyayaś chandasi).[413] Ptj has quoted one Vedic passage where this form occurs : *annādāyānnapataye.* The passage is found in *AV* (19. 55. 5) as *annādā́yā́nnapataye,* and *PdP* there shows *anna=adāya*[414] which gives *anna-* and *ada-* as the components. It is not clear if Kty had the same Vedic source in mind; for, the word *annādāya,* just to which Kty refers in his Vt, is also found (inter alia-) in *TS* (2. 2. 4), and there too *PdP* shows the same analysis[415].

But, that Kty had this *PdP* resolution in his mind before framing the present Vt, is clear. For, that gives from √*ad-* the form *ada-* (with *ac* by 3. 1. 134)[416]; while the counter-example given by Ptj to illustrate the 'variation' (Vyatyaya), viz. *ya āhutim annādīṁ kṛtvā* gives from √*ad-* the form *āda-* (with *aṇ* by 3. 2. 1.)[417] which alone (being *ṇ-it*) could be *ī*-ending in the fem. (by 4. 1. 15). The passage quoted by Ptj seems to be a quotatian again from *AV* (15. 14. 7) as *saptarṣibhir hutá ā́hutim annādī́ṁ kṛtvā́.*[418] Thus, the Vyatyaya between the Vedic Kṛdanta-s *ada* and *āda-* is here apparent.[418] If on the contrary, *annāda-* at the base of *annādāya* from the Vt were supposed to be formed from *anna-* and *āda-*, then that would furnish no case of Vyatyaya, the form being the same as in *annādī-*, viz. *āda-*; and then there would have been no necessity for Kty to lay down his Vt. Hence he must be taken to refer, on the basis of *PdP*, to *anna-* and *ada-* as the components in *annādāya,* and thereby to refer to that abnormal formation showing *ac* (giving the *ā*-ending fem. *annādā-*)[419] in contrast with the other Vedic (fem.) form *annādī-*[420] showing *aṇ*. That alone justifies the point of the Vt.[421]

The usefulness of the observation made in the Vt for the purpose of linguistic history, lies in its implication about the currency in the secular language at the time of Kty of the counter-formation, *annāda-* (i. e. *anna-* + *āda-*

---

[413] The Vt, it may be noted, only adds a specific illustration to P's comprehensive rule (3.1.85), (*chandasi* 84) *vyatyayo bahulam,* about diversity in the Vedic usage.

[414] Vol. 4, part 1 (1898?) p. 519.

[415] Vol. III, p. 359, and (for *annādaḥ*) p. 360.

[416] Making it *ā*-ending in the fem. by 4.1.4.

[417] The plural in '*kṛtām*' (*vyatyayaḥ*) "among the Kṛt suffixes," it may be noted, is comparable with that in Ptj's *supāṁ vyatyayaḥ, tiṅāṁ vyatyayaḥ* at II.64.19. (— As suggested by V. P. LIMAYE.)

[418] Very strangely, however, the *PdP* resolution shows *anna=adīm* here (vol. III, pt. 1, 1898, p. 339) and at 15.14.9 (o.c., p. 340), and *anna=adīḥ* on *annādīḥ* at 15.14.5 (o.c., p. 339). That makes the Kṛdanta member to be *ada-* showing the suffix *ac*.

[419] Attested twice in *AiBr* (5.25).

[420] Attested in *ChUp* (4.3.8 : *saiṣā virāḍ annādī*), *ŚBr* (12.2.4.5 : as *annāītamā-*) and *ŚāBr* (27.5).

[421] NBh remarks that since framing of a grammatical rule with an eye on the resolution (by means of an Avagraha) given in *PdP* has been rejected by Ptj at 3.1.109.2 etc., the framing of the present Vt is futile : '*na lakṣaḥena padakārā anuvartyā ityādi-bhāṣyeṇa avagrahārthatāyā lakṣaṇasya dūṣitatvād idaṁ vyartham*... (159a).

with *aṇ*[422]), with its feminine being *annādī-* and not *annādā-* which latter is from *annāda-* (i. e. *anna-* + *ada-* with *ac*).

That shows that the secular usage did not change in this case after the time of P. Not only that; it remained the same even upto the time of Ptj who does not present us with a different usage of his times.

The form is attested in *Manu* (8.317) but only in the masculine, giving thereby no indication whether its second member was *ada-* (with *ac*) or *āda-* (with *aṇ*).

Addenda to << 9 >>

(Formations by Sūtra 3. 2. 1.)

Obsn 103 : (i) It is possible that P and Kty used the form *kumbha-kāra-*, and possibly even *nagara-kāra-*.

(ii) The two forms occurred frequently in the usage of Ptj.

Ptj has cited the form, *kumbha-kāra-* "the maker of an earthen jar, a potter", twice independently and six times in sole association with the form, *nagara-kāra-* "a city-builder" ; he has also once used ths feminine forms, *kumbha-kārī-* and *nagara-kārī-*, by the side of eachother (II. 206. 12). So the two seem to have served as stock examples to him.

Of all these, once (I. 418.4) he cites them as instances where the formation as an Upapada–compound is to be preferred to one as a Sasṭhī-tatpuruṣa compound (on the Vt 2.2.19.3) Further, he once (II. 75.13) cites the two to express that *kumbha-* and *nagara-* are to be taken as the Upapada-s (to √*kṛ-*). On 3. 2. 1, 6. (II. 94. 19.) he further wants us to understand *kumbha-* and *nagara-* as only objective Upapada-s and to derive the two compound forms with the *karmopapada* suffix (viz. *aṇ*, enjoined by *karmaṇy aṇ* 3.2.1). The *īkārānta* feminine counterprats of the two cited by him (II.206.12) further strengthen the derivation of the forms with the suffix *aṇ* (which alone can get the *īkārānta* forms by 4.1.15).

It is not unlikely that the words, *kumbha-* and *nagara-*, of common currency at the time of P made possible the formation of the two compound-forms as well at the time. But there cannot be full certainty of that chiefly in the case of *nagara-kāra-*. The same has to be said of the time of Kty, although both the forms were quite current of the time of Ptj.

In literature *nagara-kāra-* is not attested; but *kumbha-kāra-* occurs in *MBhr* (1.176.6) and *Rām* (2.77.12).

Obsn 104 : (i) P and Kty most probably did not use the form, *mahā-kumbha-kāra-*.

(ii) Ptj gave his sanction to its use if only it was derived from '*mahā-kumbhaṁ karoti*'.

---

[422] Cp. *PdM* (490) on 3.2.68 : *bhāṣāyām aṇ eva bhavati*.

In reply to a query about the possibility to derive a form like ***mahā-kumbha-kāra-*** "one who makes a big jar" (*'na vā bhavitavyaṁ mahā-kumbha-kāra iti?'* II.75.22), Ptj says that the form can be had provided it were derived directly from ***'mahā-kumbhaṁ karoti'*** (where ***mahā-kumbha-*** "a big jar" is already an entity got as a Karmadhāraya compound by 6.3.46 and 1.2.42 from ***'mahān kumbhaḥ'***); if, however, the the basis were supposed to be the Vākya, ***'mahāntaṁ kumbhaṁ karoti'***, it would not derive the form, ***m***^{0}***k***^{0}***kāra-***, as in that case the Kṛdanta from √*kṛ-* would not be possessing a close syntactical relation or *Sāmarthya* (that is an essential condition for compounding) either with ***mahāntam kumbham*** or with ***kumbham.***[423]

Now, this discussion on a particular usage, that was probably carried by Ptj's disciples with him, does not appear to bear any connections with the linguistic tradition : it just appears to be an intelligent student's query. Hence acceptance or rejection of this particular usage need not be fathered upon P or Kty on theoretical grounds. The usage may be take to bear relevance (if at all any) only at the time of Ptj.

Further, the discussion appears to be such as being based on an imaginary or possible usage rather than on an actual one : whether ***'mahāntaṁ***

---

[428] The line of technical reasoning is this :

In contrast with the convention of employing the shortest possible term as a technical term (*'saṁjñā ca nāma yato na laghīyaḥ'* — Ptj), we find in 'Upapada' use of a long term (*'mahā-saṁjñā'*); hence the object of P by this must be to make it endowed with a significance that is true to its formation or etymology. (*'tatra mahatyāḥ saṁjñāyāḥ karaṇa etat prayojanam, anvartha-saṁjñā yathā vijñāyeta'* — Ptj.) — Thus, an 'Upapada' is not merely whatever is expressed by means of the locative case (*tatropapadaṁ saptamīstham*, 3.1.92), but is to be understood as a contiguous word (*'upoccāri padam upapadam* iti' II.16.8). — Inasmuch as an Upapada is thus understood to be bearing some 'smell' (i.e. relation to the idea) of a 'Pada' (*'yāvatā cedānīṁ pada-gandho 'sti'* II.76.9 and *bhāṣye gandha-śabdaḥ saṁbandhavācī* NBh 132 b), this (Pratyaya-vidhi) rule, *karmaṇy aṇ* that operates here (and also such other rule that relates to an Upapada) becomes a Pada-vidhi (*'padavidhir ayaṁ bhavati'* l.c.), the condition of its operation being the Upapada which is an *upoccāri*) Pada (*pada-nimittatvāt pratyaya-vidher iti bhāvaḥ*, Kaiy 132 b).

But what do we find in our sentence, *'mahāntaṁ kumbhaṁ karoti'* ? — (1) *'mahāntaṁ kumbham'* is contiguous with *'karoti'*; but it is not a 'Pada' (*'yac cātropoccāri na tat padam'* II.76.8-9), but a collection of Pada-s (*padasamudāyatvād iti bhāvaḥ*, Kaiy l.c.) : so it cannot be compounded with a Kṛdanta from √*kr-*. (2) *'mahāntam'* is a Pada, but not a contiguous one (*'yac ca padam — mahāntam iti etat* Kaiy l.c. — *na tad upoccāri'* II.76.9) : so this too cannot be compounded. (3) Lastly, *'kumbham'* is both a Pada as well as a contiguous one; but as it possesses expectancy with *'mahāntam'*, it loses a close relationship with *'karoti'* : hence not satisfying the basic condition for compounding, this too cannot be compounded with the Kṛdanta from √*kṛ-*. (*'padavidhiś ca samarthānāṁ bhavati. tatrāsāmarthyān na bhaviṣyati'*. II.76.10. See Kaiy l.c. : *kumbham ity etac ca yadyapi padaṁ bhavati upoccāritaṁ ca, tathāpi sāpekṣatvād asāmarthyāt pratyayotpattinimittaṁ na bhavati.*)

kumbhaṁ karoti' can on grammatical grounds yield the compound **mahā-kumbha-kāra-*. It must be carried on by a section of Ptj's students mainly to satisfy or assert their alertness in points of intellectual niceties; but the form might not actually be in the common usage of the people in those times.

The form is not attested in literature

Obsn 105 : (i) P and Kty probably did not use the form, **kumbhī-kāra-*, They did not use the form, *kāśa-kaṭī-kāra-*.

(ii) Gonardīya favoured the use of the latter form.

(iii) Ptj accepted *kāśa-*⁰ only on the authority of Gonardīya, but rejected all forms like **kumbhī-kāra-*.

I

A point was raised before Ptj whether a root (like √*kṛ-*), when preceded by an Upapada ending in the suffix *cvi* (that was enjoined by P by 5.4.50), could take the *karmopapada* suffix *aṇ*; e.g., whether[424] it was allowable to form a noun like *kumbhī-kāra-* to express the sense of *kumbhī-karoti* in such a phrase as *kumbhi-karoti mṛdam* "he turns clay into a jar", where '*kumbhī-karoti*' stands for '*a-kumbhaṁ kumbhaṁ karoti*'. (Vide, *atha cvy-anta upapade, kim* '*aṇā*' *bhavitavyam, a-kumbhaṁ kumbhaṁ karoti kumbhī-karoti mṛdam iti*? II.76.11-12.)[425]

Ptj's answer to this was in the negative; and the reasons he gave for that were as follows. The *cvi* was enjoined after a term expressing a modified or resultant object; and the intention in its application was to refer to the cause or the raw material (of the finished product)[426]. Hence the term ending in *cvi* became dependent upon (or expectant of) the term experessing the cause or the raw material; and thereby it ceased to bear a close syntactical relation with the Kṛdanta that may follow. Compounding as a rule, however, takes place (by 2. 1. 1) between two syntactically related members. As such, no compounding like *_kumbhī-kāra-_ is possible[427] in the present case[428]. (Vide *na bhavitavyam. kiṁ kāraṇam? prakṛti-vivakṣāyāṁ cvir vidhīyate. tat sāpekṣam. sāpekṣaṁ cāsamarthaṁ bhavati*. II, 76. 12—13.)

---

[424] Reproduces KIELHORN, *IA* (1886) 15.82.

[425] This was probably (— as suspected by Kaiy —) on the supposition that a Cvy-anta (which had already become an adverb by 1.1.37, 1.4.56 and 1.4.61, and which continued to give the idea of a substance like the adverbs of the *svarādi-gaṇa* from 1.1.37) could still be looked upon as an object and hence as a Karmopapada falling under the operation of the rule, *karmaṇy aṇ* (3.2.1). See Kaiy (133a) : *cvy-antasya cāvyayatve 'pi karmatvaṁ manyate.* (NBh, l.c. : *svar-ādi-vad iti śeṣaḥ.*) *sattva-bhūtasyānivartanāt.* (NBh, l.c. : *cvipratyaye 'pi svāśraya-sattva-bhāvasya nivṛttau mānābhāvād iti bhāvaḥ.*)

[426] There is an implied reference here to Kty's Vt (5.4.50.2), *prakṛti-vivakṣā-grahaṇaṁ ca.* Also, Kaiy, l.c. : *prakṛti-vikārayor abheda-vivakṣāyāṁ cvir vidhīyate. tatrāvaśyaṁ vikāreṇa prakṛti-viśeṣo 'pekṣaṇīyaḥ, tad-anapekṣāyāṁ cver abhāvāt,*

II

However, probably someone of Ptj's students detected either

(1) the grammarian Gonardīya recording his firm view favouring (' *icchāmi* ') the form, *kāśa-kaṭī-kāra-* " one who turns grass into a mat, "[429] or

(2) the use of a sentence, *icchāmy ahaṁ kāśa-kaṭī-kāram* " I want one who can turn grass into mat."

So he went on to ask whether (following the logic behind rejecting *_kumbhī-kāra-_) use of a form like *kāśa-kaṭī-kāra-* was also to be rejected. (*na tarhi=idānīm idaṁ bhavati*[430] ' *icchāmy ahaṁ kāśa-kaṭī-kāram* ' *iti* ? II. 76. 13–14). For, here was a case where an attempt was found made of compounding the sentence, ' *kāśān kaṭī-karoti* ', that was basically exactly alike the ' *mṛdaṁ kumbhī-karoti* ' above (II. 76. 11–12). (*kāśa-* and *kaṭa-* are found used even by P.)

Ptj s elliptical reply to this is this (– to be connected after *na tarhi* etc. above –) : *iṣṭam eva=etad gonardīyasya* (II. 76. 14)[431]. This has to be understood probably thus : " What you say is true. The *cvi*-ending ' *kaṭī* ' (where *kaṭa-* is the Vikṛti) would be *sāpekṣa* of ' *kāśa-* ' (the Prakṛti), and hence

---

[427] It has to be noted, however, that the query and the reply relate here only in respect of applying the suffix *'aṇ'*; in the case of the other suffixes (e.g. *kta*) compounding with a Cvy-anta was neither prohibited nor doubted. Further, the prohibition in the above case is to be understood to constitute an **exception** to the general rule, *ku-gati-prādayaḥ* (2.2.18), and to the Vt, *gati-kāraka=upapadānāṁ kṛdbhiḥ saha samāsa-vacanam* (4.1.48.4), that enjoin compounding with a Kṛdanta, (among others) of a 'Gati' which a Cvy-anta is by 1.4.61.

[428] It should be noted, however, that in a different context, i.e. where there is no *cvy-anta* Upapada, a form like *kumbhī-kāra-* was possible (even in the usage of Ptj), as in that case the form *kumbhī-* itself could be the object Upapada. This *kumbhī-* (probably as a diminutive of *kumbha-*) is found recorded in the usage of Ptj (I.264.2.3) as the first member of the compound, *kumbhī-dhānya-* (I.264. 2.3.4, III.174.9). Similarly, Kty too once records *ghaṭa-* and *ghaṭī-* side by side (3.2.9.1); *ghaṭī-* is also recorded by Ptj once in his own Vt (II.102.14) and once in a secular stanza quoted by him (I.3.3). However, we do not know for certain about this usage of *kumbhī-kāra-* at the time of Ptj.

[429] This is how KIELHORN has understood the line to mean. Says he (loc. cit.) : "Do we then not find the following, viz., 'I maintain (that we ought to say) *kāśakaṭīkāra,* one who turns grass into a mat'*?" and (op. cit., p. 83) : "* 'I maintain that *kāśakaṭīkāra* is correct Sanskṛit.' "

[430] *'bhavati'* might be rendered as *'yujyate'* (through *yuktaṁ bhavati*) "is sound or reasonable" in the interpretation (1) of the line, and as *'sidhyati'* "be established on reason" in the interpretation (2).

[431] Rendered by KIELHORN as : "Gônardīya certainly maintains (that) this is correct," (*IA,* o.c., p. 82.)

a–samartha towards '*kāra–*'; so, like **kumbhī–kāra–*, **kaṭī–kāra–* would be a form grammatically incorrect; and so the genitive Tatpuruṣa compound *kāśa-kaṭī–kāra–* (—perhaps like **mṛt–kumbhī–kāra*—) too could be branded similarly.

But, the authority of Gonardīya sides with that form, declaring it to be correct. And that must silence all arguments. His authority, like the Śiṣṭa-prayoga, must be respected', [432]

Now, KIELHORN has shown first that Gonardīya was a grammarian not to be identifind with Ptj but one who was different from him; [433] secondly, that he "in all probability lived after Kâtyâyana"; [434] and thirdly, that he was a writer of grammatical Kārikā–s[435] of which the present line (which must be showing "the very words in which Gonardīya had expressed his opinion") sounded like one[436].

The foregoing leads to the following observations : P and Kty, for want of evidence, need not be supposed to be having forms like **kumbhī–kāra–* in the usages of their times. Gonardīya observed and sanctioned the use of one form, *kāśa–kaṭī–kāra–*, which ordinarily was not acceptable to Ptj on grammatical grounds but was received by him out of respect for the authority of Gonardīya. Other analogical forms like **kumbhī–kāra–* were rejected by him on grammatical grounds.

In literature, these two forms are not to be met with anywhere.

Obsn 106 : (i) It is not known whether P and/or Kty used the form *kāṇḍa–lāva–* or not.

(ii) Ptj had it in the usage of his time.

Ptj noted in his usage the form, *kāṇḍa–lāva–* " one who cuts the branches (of a tree)". This form can be derived by P's rule, *karmaṇy aṇ* (3. 2. 1), by adding the suffix *aṇ* to √*lū–* having *kāṇḍa–* as the Karmopapada (*kāṇḍāni lunāti iti*). Ptj also refuses to derive the form as a Bahuvrīhi compound, on the ground that the expansion of such a compound was not current in the usage (*naiṣo ' sti*

---

[432] Note Kaiy, l.c. : *kāśān kaṭī-karoti=ity atra tu='iṣṭyā'*=aṇ-pratyayo bhavati. tasminn utpanne, kāśa-śabdāt kṛd-yoge ṣaṣṭhī. tasyāḥ "ṣeṣṭhī=iti samāsaḥ. samāsarūpasyaiva ca='iṣṭatvena'*=upāttatvāt 'kāśānāṁ kaṭī-kāra' iti vākyaṁ na bhavati=ity āhuḥ.* (*Refers to Gonardīya's view.)

[433] *IA* (1883) 12.227; (1886) 15.81-83. Also, in between the two studies : Rájendralála MITRA, "On Goṇikáputra and Gonardíya as Names of Pataṉjali", *JASB* (1883) 52.261-269.

[434] *IA* (1887) 16.105.

[435] *IA* 15.83; 16.105.

[436] *IA* 15.83.

vigrahaḥ ‘ *kāṇḍāni lāvo*[437] ’ *sya* ’=*iti*, II. 96. 7 – 8, also 96. 3 – 4). The form **lāva*– in the objective sense, “ what is to be cut ”, that hypothetically formed one of its components, did not occur in the usage.

Although the rules of P (3. 2. 1, 7. 2. 115) help in obtaining this form, it is not known if it existed in the usage of his time or in that of Kty's time. Even though the basic material of the stems was available to them (thus : *kāṇḍa*– with P five times and with Kty once), that does not warrant a definite or positive statement that they had in their usage this compound formation as well.

The form is not attested in literature.

Obsn 107 : (i) It is not known if P used the form, *grāma–ṇāya–*.
(ii) It is likely that Kty used it.
(iii) Ptj had it in his usage.

Ptj has at one place[438] mentioned the form, *grāma–ṇāya–*[439] “ one who leads the village, a village head–man ”, that occurred in his usage. The form can be derived with the suffix *aṇ* from √*nī*– preceded by the objective Upapada *grāma*– (by ***karmaṇy aṇ***, 3.2.1 : see the Vt 3.2.1.3).

It cannot be said for want of evidence that P used the compound form, although a similar form, *grāmaṇī*–, (formed with the zero–suffix ***kvip*** after √*nī*–) was well–known to the Veda and was even used by P once in a rule for secular usage, *sa eṣāṁ grāmaṇīḥ* (5.2.78), and once in a rule for Vedic usage, *śrī–grāmaṇyoś chandasi* (7.1.56).

It is not impossible that the form occurred in the usage at the time of Kty; for on the rule, *karmaṇy aṇ*, he is found to make a specific mention of √*nī*– taking the suffix *aṇ* and giving the Kṛdanta member as *nāya*– when preceded by a Karmopapada (3.2.1.3 : *hṛ–grahi–nī–vahibhyaś ca*).[440] But we cannot be fully certain of that, as the form seems to be very rare.

---

[437] ‘*jātāv ekavacanam*’ (NBh 159a) by ‘*jātyākhyāyām ekasmin bahuvacanam*’ (1.2.58), Some effort is required to derive the form, by first making the root √*lū*- (a *prakṛtārthe ṇij-anta* and hence) *ikārānta*, and then after the dropping of *i* (by 6.4.51), by applying the objective suffix *ac* enjoined by the rule, *er ac* (3.3.56).

[438] II.79.16-18 : *yadi yo rūpavān anyapūrvako bādhakaḥ prāpnoti sa vā bādhako bhavatīty ucyate, kvibādiṣu samāveśo na prāpnoti. grāmaṇīḥ grāmaṇāya iti.*

[439] The entire ms.-material utilised by KIELHORN concurs in this reading. However, the author of *TattvaB* is probably the first to expressly accept the form as *grāma-nāya-* (p. 497) instead (which is not attested in literature). But his arguments were earlier stated in *PdM* (588) on *KV* at 3.2.61. In this connection the use of ‘*gramanayanasya*’ by BhD on 1.4.5(*SK*304) is also cited. An examination of all these points is kept out here to avoid complicating the matters. Suffice it to point out, however, that acceptance of the reading with the *pa-tva* (as printed by KIELHORN) makes the form **a name** or a common noun by P's rule, *pūrvapadāt saṁjñāyām agaḥ* (8.4.3).

[440] See **Obsn 98.**

In literature the use of the form is not attested.

Hence nothing definite can be said about its history beyond this that it occurred in the usage of the time of Ptj.

Obsn 108 : (i) P did not use the forms, ***tunda-parimārja-*** and ***śokāpanoda-***

(ii) Kty used these forms in their literal sense.

(iii) Ptj's usage was the same as Kty's.

While P used the forms, *tunda-parimṛja-* "stroking (one's) belly" and *śokāpanuda-* "removing sorrow" (with *ac*), Kty used the forms, *tunda-parimārja-* and *śokāpanoda-* (with *aṇ*), in their place. — But this was not the case of a mere change in the form. It was accompanied by a corresponding change in the meaning; but that took place in the case of the earlier forms, *tunda-parimṛja-* and *śokāpanuda-*. In the usage at the time of Kty these had developed a restricted or specific sphere of meaning, viz. "slothful or torpid" and "giving delight" respectively (3.2.5.1). By implication, to express the literal meaning from the compounds of the same Upapada-s and their corresponding roots, which was a simple or general one, the new forms, *tunda-parimārja-* and *śokāpanoda-*, were used.

The same usage continued at the time of Ptj. (See II.98.16f.)

The forms are, however, not attested in literature.

(For a detailed discussion on this development, see Obsn 83.)

Obsn 67 : (This may be referred to here for the forms, *śakti-grāha-* etc.)

Obsn 109 : (i) It is not unlikely that P used the form, ***sūtra-grāha-***, and that probably in its literal sense.

(ii) Kty probably used it, and probably in the literal sense.

(iii) Ptj did use it in the literal sense.

It is possible that P used the form, *sūtra-grāha-*, that can be derived from √*grah-* with the suffix *aṇ* (by 3.2.1) and the Upapada *sūtra-*. (See Obsn 68.) If he did, that must be in its literal sense of "one holding a thread (by the hand etc.)." But evidence is wanting to be sure that he did not use the form.

Kty used the form, *sūtra-graha-*, in a particular sense (3.2.9.2). That implies that he used *sūtra-grāha-*, formed by the general rule (3.2.1), in the general or literal sense.

The same was the condition at the time of Ptj. He has further explained that general sense of *sūtra-grāha-* which was supposed in the Vt of Kty (*yo hi sūtraṁ gṛhṇāti sūtragrāhaḥ sa bhavati*, II.99.17f.).

The form is not attested in literature.

(For a fuller discussion see Obsn 68.)

Obsn 110: (i) P, Kty and Ptj, all, probably did not have in their usage the forms, **kuru-cāra-* and **pañcāla-cāra-*. They also probably did not have (Karma =) Upapada-compounds ending in *cāra-*.

P had laid down the rule. *careṣ ṭaḥ* (3.2.16), establishing formation of Upapada-compounds ending in the Kṛdanta *cara-*. In the times of Ptj this *cara-* was probably found used at the end of the Upapada-compounds, *kuru-cara-* and *pañcāla-cara-*. These compounds ending in *cara-* did not express in the usage of the times the objective ideas, *kurūñś carati* "(he, she or it) approaches the Kurus" and *pañcālāñś carati* "...... approaches the Pañcālas" respectively, although they could have done that as the idea '*karmaṇi*' could appear in the present rule from 3.2.1. (*iha kasmān na bhavati, 'kurūñś carati', 'pañcālāñś carati=iti*? II.101.2.) But the two compounds were used to express the ideas, *kuruṣu carati* "..... moves among the Kurus" and *pañcāleṣu carati* "....moves among the Pañcālas", by drawing the word '*adhikaraṇe*' from the immediately preceding rule (*adhikaraṇe śeteḥ* 3.2.15).[441]

(Before going further, reference may be made to a question that arises here : whether then it is to be supposed that to express the ideas, *kurūñś carati* and *pañcālāñś carati*, the forms, **kuru-cāra-* and **pañcāla -cāra-*, (ending in *cāra-* and formed by 3.2.1) were current in the usage of the times. This will be discussed shortly below.)

It was asked : what is the basis for this decision of preferring to have the Anuvṛtti of *adhikaraṇe* and rejecting that of *karmaṇi* in the present rule? (*nanu ca karmaṇi=ity api vartate; tatra kuta etad adhikaraṇe bhaviṣyati, na punaḥ karmaṇi=iti*? II.101.3)

The question is used as an introduction to the Vt of Kty (3.2.16.1) that purports to be a general answer probably to a general query impliedly put to him and expressly mentioned by Ptj as above by taking two specific instances from the usage of his own times.

Kty's answer is as follows. Immediately after laying down a rule for the formation of Upapada-compounds ending in the Kṛdanta *cara-* (< √*car-*+*ṭa*), in a separate rule, P has established Upapada-compounds ending in the same Kṛdanta *cara-* when preceded by *bhikṣā, senā-* and *ādāya-* as the Upapada-s. (3.2.16.1 : *carer bhikṣā-grahaṇaṁ jñāpakaṁ karmaṇy aprasaṅgasya.*) If P had thought of an objective Upapada in the *careṣ ṭaḥ* rule, he would not have again put the (objective) Upapada '*bhikṣā-*' in the very next rule; for, the purpose of having it would have been served by the present rule itself, and there would then have been redundancy. (See fn. 441.)

This indicates (1) that Kty's usage did not show *bhikṣa-cara-* with *bhikṣā-* expressing the location, (2) that it did not show the specific form, *bhikṣā-cāra-*

---

[441] See KIELHORN, *IA* (1887) 16.244.

(that could be derived by 3.2.1 form √*car–* with *aṇ*, *bhikṣā–* being an objective Upapada), and (3) that also in general it did not show any form ending in the Kṛdanta **cāra–* (that can be so formed by 3.2.1 only when √*car–* is preceded by an objective Upapada).

Return may now be made to the discussion of Ptj, earlier referred to, who took two specific instances from his usage, Importance attaches to this discussion also, in the linguistic suggestion — though of a negative type —that arises from it. We refer to the suspicion, passingly mentioned at the beginning, about a possibility of the counter-forms, **kuru-cāra–* and **pañcāla-cāra–*, (showing the objective idea) being current in the usage of the times of Ptj.

It can be stated that there did **not** exist in Ptj's usage these forms, though it was possible to derive them by the general *karmaṇy aṇ* (3,2.1) rule of P. (Both P and Kty use ***kuru–*** frequently, though never ***pañcāla–***.) Had they been current, there would not have been an out-of-the-way necessity to look for the objective sense in the other forms, ***kuru-cara–*** and ***pañcāla-cara–***, and there would also not have been difficulty to see the location sense in these latter forms. — Secondly, if the mention at 3.2.17 of the objective Upapada ***bhikṣā–*** ('***bhikṣā-grahaṇa***', that is taken as an 'indication' by Kty) were **not** there, then there **would** have been a possibility to suspect an objective sense in ***kuru-cara–*** and ***pañcāla-cara–***. This also suggests that there did not exist in Ptj's usage the forms, ***kuru-cāra–*** and ***pañcāla-cāya–***, that could be regularly derived by 3.2.1. — Thirdly, Ptj has (— against his practice and style —) not mentioned here any counter-forms in the object sense to ***kuru-cara–*** and ***pañcāla-cara–***, which could only be ***kuru-cāra–*** and ***pañeāla-cāra–***.

Thus it can be said that the object idea was expressed neither in ***kuru-cara–*** and ***pañcāla-cara–***, nor in ***kuru-cāra–*** and ***pañcāla-cāra–***, but only through the full sentences (Vākya–s), ***kurūñ ścarati*** and ***pañcālāñś carati***.

The conclusion is endorsed by the fact that the forms, ***kuru-cāra–***, ***pañcāla-cāra–*** and ***bhikṣā-cāra–***, are not attested in literature. Not only that; no compound-form ending in ***cāra–*** and showing an objective Upapada has been recorded for Vedic literature in the *VWC Consolidated Indices* (II.296f.).

Obsn 111 : (i) P did not derive the forms, *dārv-āghāta–* and *cārv-āghāṭa–*. Probably these did not occur in the usage of his times. However, it is not unlikely that *cārv-āghāta–* was used in his days.
(ii) Kty and Ptj had them in their usages.

P (3. 2. 49) had enjoined the suffix *ḍa* after √*han–* in Upapada-compounds when benediction was intended (cf. *śatru-ha–*). When not a benediction, the forms could be derived from √*han–* with the general *karmopapada* suffix *aṇ*; in that case (i. e. before a *ṇ-it* suffix), the *h* of √*han–* would be changed ***gh*** (by 7. 3. 54) and the *n* to *t* (by 7. 3. 32), and the Kṛdanta would be ***ghāta–*** (cf. *śatru-ghāta–*). But Kty, detected some non-benedictory forms showing also the suffix *aṇ* according to P, but ending in *ghāṭa-* (instead of *ghāta-*), i. e. showing the final *ṭ* (in place of *t*). So he enumerated those in his Vt-s on this Sūtra [442] of P.—Ptj's paraphrase of the Vt-s, recording the examples meant by Kty, without any objection, indicates that Ptj too had noticed those forms in the usage of his days.

Thus, the first form wanted by Kty to be established was the name, *dārv-āghāṭa-* "striking the wood (constantly), the wood-pecker" (3. 2. 49. 1: *dārāv āhano ' ṇ antyasya ca ṭaḥ saṁjñāyām*). This is derived from the Karmopapada *dāru-* and a Kṛdanta from *ā- √han-* with *aṇ*. The form has been illustrated by Ptj in the phrase *dārvāghāṭas te vanaspatīnām*. The phrase, however, is found to be a quotation from *VS* (24.35), [443] *TS* (5, 5. 15), [444] *MS* (3. 14. 16) and *KāṭhS-AśvamedhaGrantha* (7. 5.), thus : (*godhā́ kā́lakā*) *dārvāghāṭás* [445] *te vánaspátīnām*. Further, the form is derived in the Commentaries on *TPr* (7. 13: *vāghāṣapūrvas taṣ ṭam*) and *VPr* (3. 48 : *ta āghād anāḍambarāt*). It is included in the *madhvādi-gaṇa* [446] referred to at 4. 2. 86 and in the *PhiṭSūtra* (III. 16). In literature, it occurs in *MBhr* (10. 7. 18), and is mentioned by Kullūka on *Manu* (5. 13) as an instance of the *pratuda*-type of birds (thus, *pratudān* : *pratudya cañcvā ye bhakṣayanti tān dārvāghāṭādīn*).

Now, even if it were supposed that *VS* was not known to P [447], the same cannot be said of *TS*; and his non-derivation of the form inspite of that is probably due to the absence of its currency in everyday use in his times (though he has used *dāru-* at 5. 4. 114).

Kty's Vt might suggest that when **not** a name the form from the same components would be **dārv-āghāta-*. But as it is not attested in literature, Kty may not be said to be implying it laying stress on the condition, ' *saṁjñāyām* ' : he might be simply stating the complete situation of the occurrence of the single form, *dārv-āghāṭa-*, current in the usage as a Saṁjñā.

When, however, the Karmopapada [448] before *ā- √han-* was *cāru-*, the form in Kty's usage ended in *ṭa* as optional to the one in *ta* (3. 2. 49. 2: *cārau vā*). Thus, we get from Kty's usage, both the forms, *cārv-āghāṭa-* as well as

---

[442] Actually, the better place was the Sūtra 3.2.1.

[443] Where Mahīdhara renders the form as *'sārasaḥ'* "a water-bird" !

[444] Bhaṭṭa Bhāskara renders the form as *'druma-kukkuṭaḥ'*.

[445] *MS* reads : *dārvāghā́ṭas.*

[446] Though not in its reconstruction by BIRWE (32).

[447] See fn. 297 on Obsn **71.**

[448] About the declinable (object) nature of an adverb, see fn. 521 on Obsn **130.**

cārv–āghāta–"striking nicely." [449] Neither of the two forms is attested in literature, Vedic or post–Vedic. So it cannot be said with certainty that P might have known or used them (though he has used the word *cāru–* at 6. 2. 160). The two, or at least the first one (with *ṭa–tva*), could as well be new formations developed by the time of Kty and continued to be used in the times of Ptj. But it is not unlikely that the second one of the two (with *ta–tva*), that could be derived by the rules of P, was also actually used in his days.

Obsn 112 : (i) P neither derived nor used the forms, *varṇa–saṁghāṭa–* and *pada–saṁghāṭa–*. It is possible that his usage contained these forms ending instead in *ta*.

(ii) Kty's usage showed a number of compounds having a Karmopapada and ending in *saṁghāṭa–* or *saṁghāta–*. So the above (two or) four specific forms could be taken for granted in his usage.

(iii) Ptj had the above four forms in the usage of his times.

Among the Upapada–compounds ending in *ghāṭa–* or *ghāta–*, derived from √*han–* with *aṇ*, Kty notes, in general, forms containing **any** Karmopapada to the root *saṁ–* √*han–* (and not √*han–*). (3. 2. 49. 3 : *karmaṇi sami ca.*)[450]. That shows that Kty had in his usage quite a number of compounds ending in *saṁghāṭa–* or *saṁghāta–* and containing a Karmopapada. Of compounds ending in each of this Kṛdanta–pair, Ptj supplies two illustrations : *pada*^{0} and *varṇa*^{0}.[450a]

Such forms, as checked from the *VWC Consolidated Indices*, are not found to occur in the early Vedic literature. *pada–saṁghāṭa*^{0}*–* and *varṇa–saṁghāṭa*^{0}*–* occur in *BḌ* (2. 117) in the line, *padasaṁghāta–jaṁ vākyam, varṇasaṁghāta–jaṁ padam*[450b]. However, the forms occur there in the action sense (" an aggregation of words ", " . . . . . of letters "[451], and hence with a different suffix [452] after *saṁ- √han-* and as the Saṣṭhī-tatpuruṣa compounds. In the present case, on the contrary, the context suggests the derivation of the forms in the agent sense, as " one who collects or codifies the words, a lexicographer " and " one who collects the sounds, a phonetician ", --- *varṇa-saṁghāta-* is further noted to be occurring in the *Śaiśirīya-Śikṣā* (354) : *vedo hi varṇa-saṁghāto vedo brahmeti kīrtyate* (P. 216), and in *KauArth* (2. 10. 14) as *varṇa-saṁghātaḥ padam* (P. 49). Here again the form shows the action sense.

---

[449] *PW* (1.224) renders them as *"wohl schön auf einem Instrumente spielend"*, which, in the rendering of *MW* (394), is "playing well on an instrument (?)". WILSON's earlier rendering is quoted in *PW* (2.997) to be "destructive of beauty" (—see the *Shabda-Sagara*, p. 267); that understands *cāru-* as a noun and a Karmopapada.

[450] The *'ca'* is to get the Anuvṛtti of *'vā'* (standing for *ṭa-tva* or *ta-tva*) from the preceding Vt. Otherwise, *saṁghāta*-ending forms could be derived by P's rules.

[450a] The Vt cannot be interpreted to yield the forms, *karma-saṁghāṭa-* and *karma-saṁghāta-*, which are nowhere found attested.

[450b] The whole stanza is found quoted in (Bhartṛhari's Svopajña ?) *Vṛtti* on the *Vākyapadīya* 1.24-26. ((See K. A. Subramania IYER, ed. of Kāṇḍa I, Poona, 1966, p. 78. Appendix II therein traces it (p. 243), with a question mark, to the *Saṅgraha*.) See the same edition for the English Translation (of Chapter I, Poona, 1965, p. 36) of the line : "The sentence is born of a collection of words and the word is born of a collection of phonemes."

So it can be taken that Kty was aware of these specific forms that illustrate his Vt to some extent (i. e. without the *ṭa-tva* and without the agent sense in them). His reference to a Karmopapada suggests definitely that he understood them in the agent sense. Hence it is quite likely that he used these forms ending in *ta* as well.

It is Ptj who has first noted the two forms together with their alternants (i. e. in all four forms); but beyond noting them, he has not supplied us with any information regarding the context in which they occurred. Still, his acceptanc of the forms as Karmopapada-compounds indicates that he too understood them in the agent sense.

As for P, for want of evidence we cannot be much certain of his use of the forms, *varṇa-saṁghāta-* and *pada-saṁghāta-* (that did not show the *ṭa-tva*). But as these could be derived by his rules, it is not unlikely that they were in use at his times.

varṇa-samghāṭa- and *pada -saṁghāṭa-* are not attested in literature.

---

[451] MACDONELL, *BD*, Part II, p. 64.

[452] *ghañ*, by the rule, *bhāve* (3.3.18).

<< 10 >> FORMS IN *-A*$_6$ (*ṬAK*)

(Sūtra-s : 3.2.8, 52-55)

Obsn 113 : (i) P used *pī*-ending feminine compound-forms derived either from √*pā*- "to drink" or from √*pā*- "to protect" that was preceded by any Karmopapada.

(ii) Kty used *pī*-ending compounds (1) when the root was preceded only by *surā*- or *sīdhu*- as the Karmopapada, and (2) when derived only from √*pā*- "to drink". —By implication, he used *pā*-ending compounds in conditions that were different from (1) or (2).

(iii) Ptj retained the usage of Kty with its implications, as he conversely used the *pā*-ending forms, (1′) like *kṣīra-pā*- which was derived from √*pā*- ("to drink") that was preceded by a Karmopapada other than *surā*- or *sīdhu*- and (2′) like *surā-pā*- ("a woman protecting wine") which was derived from √*pā*- "to protect".

As a general phenomenon P had in his usage the feminine primary forms that were derived from *anupasarga ā*-ending roots and Karmopapada-s, to be *ākārānta*; hence was enjoined the suffix *ka* by him in such cases (3.2.3 : *āto' nupasarge kaḥ*) that got them as such (with *ṭāp* by 4.1.4). However, he noted such. forms to be *īkārānta* when the root at the base of these was either √*gai*- or √*pā*-, thus showing forms ending in *gī*- or *pī*- respectively (instead of in *gā*- or *pā*- respectively). Further, as for the root √*pā*-, to him it was probably both, (1) meaning "to protect" as well as (2) meaning "to drink". So he framed the rule *gā-poṣ ṭak* (3.2.8), enjoining the suffix *ṭak* that, being a *ṭ-it*, established the wanted feminine forms in *ī* (with *ṅīp* by 4.1.15.).[453]

By the time of Kty, such forms ending in *pī*- showed a much limited occurrence, viz. (1) only when the Karmopapada was either *surā*- or *sīdhu*- "wine", and (2) when √*pā*- meant only "to drink".[454] Hence his Vt, *surā-sīdhvoḥ pibateḥ* (3.2.8.1). Thus,

---

[453] As for the masculine forms, although the same suffix *ṭak* from this rule could establish them, it made no difference in the form whether the suffix applied was *ṭak* or was *ka;* hence it follows that the object of P in framing this rule was to establish the feminine forms (in *ī* instead of in *ā*).

(1) "a woman drinking wine (expressed only by the term, *surā-* or *sīdhu-*)" was termed ***surā-pī-*** or ***sīdhu-pī-***;

but (2) "a woman drinking (say:) milk (*kṣīra-*)" was termed *kṣīra-pā-*[455]; and

(3) "a woman guarding wine (***surā-***, and probably also, ***sīdhu-***)" was termed ***surāpā-***[455] (and probably also ***sīdhu-pā-***[455]).

The same situation appears to have prevailed in the usage at the time of Ptj. The two negative exmples in explantion of Kty's Vt, *kṣīra-pā-* and ***surā-pā-***, stated above and corresponding to the two converse conditions, are found recorded by Ptj. Of these, the second form, viz. *surā-pā-*, follows from the Vt itself, as *surā-* is already recorded therein. The first one, viz *'kṣīra-pā-*, however, is first supplied by Ptj probably from his own usage, *kṣīrapā brāhmaṇī* (II.99.3). It cannot be said with the same degree of certainty about ***surā-pā-*** (in the sense of "a woman protecting wine") that it was not supplied by Ptj just to illustrate the negative force of the Vt, but was a form actually current in the usage of his own time as well. (*yā hi surāṁ pāti surāpā sā bhavati*, II.99.4).

In literature, in the "drinking" sense *svrā-pī-* occurs early in *Manu* (5.90) while *sīdhu-p̃-* is not attested; in the "protecting" sense ***surā-pā-*** as well as *sihdu-pī-* are not attested. In the masculine, however, ***surā-pa-*** ("drinking") is attested in *MBhr*, *Rām* and *Manu*, and *kṣīra-pa-* (only) in (the Calcutta ed. of) *MBhr* (13.5986).

Obsn 114: (i) P used *pī*-ending feminine forms derived from √*pā*-"to protect or from √*pā*- "to drink" and any Karmopapada.

(ii) Kty saw no law in the case of conventional terms in use of *pā*-ending or *pī*-ending femininine formes so derived.

(iii) Ptj is not definitely known to have retained **Kty**'s usage.

---

[454] The commentators from Jin(endrabuddhi) onwards, however, appear to attribute this statement of the Vt to the intention of the Sūtra itself, which 'interpretation' of the Sūtra shows lack of the historical sense. — Kaiy (163a) saying *lugvikaraṇa-paribhāṣā-labhya=artha-kathanam* is anticipated by Jin : *'lugvikaraṇa=alugvikaraṇayor [a]lugvikaraṇasyaiva grahaṇam' iti, 'pā' iti pānārthasya grahaṇam, rakṣaṇārthasya na* (*Ny* 548). This is based on the Vt, *gā-por grahaṇa iṇ-pibatyor grahaṇam* 2.4.77.1), and especially on the *M* line thereat, *vaktavyam eva*=(v.l. *uktam*) *etat "sarvatraiva pā-grahaṇe "lugvikaraṇasya grahaṇam" iti* (I.495. 14-15). This is NBh's Paribhāṣā 90 in his *PŚ*. — Apart from the unhistorical nature of the interpretation of the Sūtra, the fact, that the Bāhulya or "diversity" noted by Kty in the very next Vt (3.2.8.2) (though only in respect of certain types of forms) **takes away** the specification or restriction of √*pā-* as being only √*pā-* "to drink", goes against the scholiasts' fixation of √*pā-* from P's rule to √*pā-* "to drink".

[455] With *ka* by 3.2.3.

P's usage had showed *pī*-ending feminine compound-forms derived from √*pā*-"to protect" or from √*pā*- "to drink" and with any Karmopapada (3.2.8: *gā-poṣ ṭak*). In his first Vt on this rule of P, was embodied Kty's observation that (in his time) *pī*-ending forms were seen only in the "drinking" sense and showing as the Karmopapada-s only *surā*- and *sīdhu*-; obviously in conditions other than these, the use of *pā*-ending forms was noted by him to be current at his time. Still he observed in certain cases a wide-spread diversity in this regard. The diversity about the use of *pā*-ending or *pī*-ending forms was seen by him in the Vedic language and in the conventional terms (Saṁjñā-Śabda-s) from the secular language (3. 2. 8. *2* : *bahulaṁ taṇi*)[456]. This implied three things :

(1) the use of *pā*-ending as well as *pī*-ending forms (in the sense of "drinking"), showing alternatively the suffix *ka* or the suffix *ṭak* respectively after √*pā*- when preceded by *surā*- or by *sīdhu*-;

(2) the use of *pā*-ending or *pī*-ending forms in the sense of "protecting", the Karmopapada being *surā*- or *sīdhu*-; and

(3) the use of *pā*- ending or *pī*- ending forms in both the senses of √*pā*-, even when the Karmopapada was other than *surā*- or *sīdhu*-, i. e. say *kṣīra*-.

Unfortunately, Ptj has recorded only the Vedic [457] usage in illustration of the Vt (in fact, only of the first of the three possible implications of the Vt) : *yā brāhmaṇī surāpī bhavati nainām devāḥ patilokaṁ nayanti*; *yā brāhmaṇī surāpā bhavati nainām devāḥ patilokaṁ nayanti* (II. 99. 6-8). This has been partially traced to *VDhSū* (21.11):[458]

> *yā brāhmaṇī ca surāpī na tāṁ devāḥ patilokaṁ nayanti* /
> *ihaiva sā carati kṣīṇapuṇyā ' psu lug bhavati śuktikā vā* // [459]

The verse, however, shows only *surā-pī*-, but not *surā-pā*- beside it. This affords us no peep into the diverse usage in the field of conventional names current at the time of Ptj. It is possible that Ptj's silence on this is indicative of the absence of large currency of such expressions in the usage of his times: for had they been as prominently present then as in the time of Kty, he would not have failed to record such an important linguistic phenomenon.[460]

---

[456] Kty uses the term *'taṇi'* (loc. sg. of *'taṇ-'*) which is understood by Ptj to be standing for Saṁjñā and Chandas.

[457] If the identification of the source of Ptj's passage is correct, it may be noted that Ptj treats *VDhSū* as a 'Chandas'.

[458] By A. GHOSH ("A Study of the Smṛti Passages in the Mahābhāṣya," *IHQ* (1935) 11.77-90).

[459] RENOU on Ptj's quotation, however, remarks : source *"brāhmaṇa"*. See *JA* (1953) 241.444, from section II 'Le Veda chez Patañjali' of his article, "Études Pāṇinéennes".

As for P the diversity in regard to the Vedic usage was time and again noted by him; but not so the one in regard to the conventional names. It follows then that the conventional terms showing √*pā-* at the end were regularly governed by his rule, *gā-poṣ ṭak*, that made no distinction between the types of forms derived by it. That means that the introduction of diversity in such terms was a later development noted in the language by Kty.

Obsn 115 : P (and probably also Kty) used the forms *jāyā-ghna-* and *pati- ghna-* (°*ghnī*-f.), probably to refer to a significant bodily mark, and perhaps also to refer to a person possessing such a mark as being himself an (indirect) indicator of a future happening.

(ii) Ptj used the forms, both as a significant mark and as a person possessing it,

In referring to a (bodily) mark or characteristic, P had in his usage the forms, *jāyā-ghna-* (°*ghnī-* f.) "wife-killing" and *pati-ghna-* (°*ghnī-* f.) "husband-killing", which were derived from the root √*han-*[461] when preceded by the Karmopapada-s *jāyā-* and *pati-* respectively. So he framed the rule, *lakṣaṇe jāyā-patyoṣ ṭak* (3.2.52), enjoining in such a situation the suffix *ṭak* that brought about the wanted forms.

But the word *lakṣaṇa-* "(bodily) mark" from the Sūtra of P gave difficulty as to its denotation by the time of Ptj. For, there were in usage at the time of Ptj, two sets each of forms, *jāyā-ghna-* m. and *pati-ghnī-* f. — (1) The one referred to the agent who possessed such a mark (*lakṣaṇavān kartā*), as in *jāyā-ghno brāhmaṇaḥ* (II. 104.7) (where *jāyā-ghna-* meant "one possessing the mark indicative of the wife's death") and *pati-ghnī vṛṣalī* (l.c.) (where *pati-ghnī-* meant " one possessing the mark indicative of the husband's death ". (2) The other set of the forms referred to the bodily mark itself being the agent ('*lakṣaṇaṁ kartā*'), as in *jāyā-ghnas tila-kālakaḥ*

---

[460] At the only two other places where Kty uses the term '*taṇī*' (2.4.54.11, 4.1.52.3), Ptj has explained it the same way but illustrated the usages only with the Saṁjñā expressions. But that was because Kty's Vt at both the places was followed by another giving the Prayojana of establishing the particular forms; while here the Vt is not followed by a Prayojana-vārttika.

[461] With the loss of the penultimate vowel (*a*) by *gama-hana-jana-khana-ghasāṁ lopaḥ kṅity anaṅi* (6.4.98), and the change of *h* to *gh* (or the *ku-tva*) by *ho hanter ñṇinneṣu* (7.3.54) and *sthāne 'ntaratamaḥ* (1.1.50).

(II. 104.6) (where *jāyā-ghna-* meant "killer - i.e. indicative of the death - of one's wife") and *pati-ghnī pāṇi-lekhā* (II. 134.6f.) (where *pati-ghnī-* meant "killer — i.e. indicative of the death — of one's husband").

This fact induces Ptj to give a peculiar interptetation of the present Sūtra and, consequently, of the next Sūtra also. — He interprets '*lakṣaṇe*' in the present Sūtra as '*lakṣaṇavati kartari*'[462], and thus derives the first set of forms, viz. *jāyā-ghna-* qualifying the agent (*brāhmaṇa-*) and *pati-ghnī-* qualifying the agent (*vṛṣalī-*), by the present Sūtra. As for the second set of forms, viz. *jāyā-ghna-* qualifying the mark (*tila-kālaka-*) and *pati-ghnī-* qualifying the mark (*pāṇi-lekhā-*), he derives them by the next Sūtra, *amanuṣya-kartṛke ca* (3.2.53)^3, taking '*amanuṣyakartṛke*' there to cover *lakṣaṇe kartari.*[463]

The water-tight nature of interpretations of the two Sūtra-s appears to be over-drawn. The word *lakṣaṇa-* should ordinarily and primarily mean a *lakṣaṇa*- "mark" alone. So P can be understood to be deriving by the present Sūtra the forms, *jāyā-ghna-* and *pati-ghnī-*, mainly as qualifying the **marks** like *tila-kālaka-, pāṇi-lekhā-* etc. As for the forms, *jāyā-ghna-* and *pati-ghnī-*, as qualifying *brāhmaṇa-* and *vṛṣalī-* respectively, it can be said that probably in such constructions also the forms were derived by P by the same Sūtra; for, a person bearing a significant or indicative mark (*lakṣaṇavat-*) can himself be said to be an indirect portender or indicator (*lakṣaṇa-*). Hence, Ptj's interpretation would have been more acceptable had it explained the Sūtra so as to have **both** the *lakṣaṇa-* and the *lakṣaṇavat-* included among its agents (denoted by the word '*lakṣaṇa-*'). — But, to hand over a form, that conveys a significant mark itself being the agent, to the sphere of the next Sūtra (*amanuṣya-kartṛke ca,* 3. 2. 53) that derives forms qualifying a non-human agent which should generally be a living animal (- by making a mark 'a non-human agent'[464]—), appears very artificial. As it has been seen there is even no need of that. (—The type of forms that can be derived by the *amanuṣya*^{0} Sūtra will be discussed in Obsn **116.**)

---

[462] Thus, the word *'lakṣaṇa-'* in the Sūtra was understood to be standing for *'lakṣaṇavat-'* or as carrying the possessive sense with the addition of the *matvarthīya akāra* after it, by the rule, *arśa-ādibhyo 'c* (5.2.127) : and the word *'lakṣaṇa-'* was supposed to be included (by Ptj) in the illustrative group (Ākṛti-gaṇa, see *KV* 416), *arśa-ādi;* it is not as found in the reconstruction by BIRWE (381).

[463] Although both Kaiy and NBh are totally silent on the two Sūtra-s, *KV, PdM* and BhD, follow the interpretation given by Ptj. See *PdM* (575) : *etac ca sūtrārambhād evāvasīyate; kevale hi lakṣaṇe uttareṇaive siddhaḥ pratyayaḥ.*

[464] Thus, *'a-manuṣya-'* here is understood in its literal sense (*iha tu manuṣyād anyaḥ sarva eva gṛhyate, PdM* 576), although in the Sūtra *sabhā rājā-'manuṣya-pūrvā* (2.4.23) it is understood by convention to refer to an evil spirit (*amanuṣya-śabdo rakṣaḥpiśācādiṣu rūḍha iti pūrvam uktam,* l.c.). The distinction is brought out by *Ny* (268) on 2.4.23 thus : *athavā 'amanuṣya-' śabdo 'yaṁ dvividhaḥ : asty evāyam a-vyutpanno rūḍhi-śabdo yo rakṣaḥ-piśāca=ādiṣu vartate; asti ca vyutpanno nañ-samāsaḥ. tatra=iha=a-vyutpannasya rūḍhi-śabdasya grahaṇam; 'amanuṣya-kartṛke ca' ityatra vyutpannasya=a-rūḍhi-śabdasya grahaṇam; ity avirodhaḥ.*

The interpretative effort of Ptj, however, serves to intimate to us that there were two types of usages current at his time. However, absence of any note from Kty probably indicates that Kty's usage was similar to P's.

Thus, there can be understood to be some sort of continuity in the usage from P to Ptj.

In literature the form *jāyā-ghna-* is not attested. *pati-ghnī-* is found used in *ŚāGSū* (1. 16. 4) as qualifying illuck (*a-lakṣmī-*); while in *ĀGSū* (1. 5. 6.) and, as *á-pati-ghnī-*, in *RV* 10. 85. 44, *AV-Ś* 14. 1. 62, 2. 17 f, and *AV-P* 2. 66. 3. it is used to qualify (a *lakṣaṇavān kartā* :) a bride. *pati-ghnī-* is also once used as qualifying (a *lakṣaṇa* :) the body (*tanū-*) of a bride, in *PGSū* (1. 11. 4). — *vṛṣala-* is well-known to early literature, and *vṛṣalī-* occurs in *ŚBr* 14. 9. 4. 12 (*vṛ́ṣalo na vṛ́ṣaly úpahanyāt*) and in the editorially rejected *MBhr* passage after 13. 90. 10 (409*, l. 3); *tila-kālaka-* is found only in *Suśruta*; and *pāṇi-lekhā-* is not attested [465]

Obsn 116 : (i) It cannot be stated with certainty that P or Kty used *śaśa-ghnī-* referring to an animate agent.

(ii) Ptj had it in his usage.

P (3. 2. 53 : *amanuṣya-kartṛke ca*) had enjoined the suffix *ṭak* after √*han-* when the resultant form was to denote a non-human agent. (See fn. 464.) By that, however, a form like *nagara-ghāta-* "destroying the town" noted by Ptj as referring to an elephant (a non-human being) and showing Vṛddhi in it (which could not be had by the suffix *ṭak*), was not excluded from being derived. So it was suggested by Ptj that the condition in the Sūtra for having *ṭak*, viz. *amanuṣya-kartṛka-tva*, be changed to *aprāṇi-kartṛka-tva* ('*aprāṇi-kartṛka*' *iti vaktavyam*, II. 104. 14) so as to exclude all animate beings from being the agent. Thus, if only the agent were a purely inanimate thing the form was to show *ṭak*; and *nagara-ghāta-* having an elephant as the agent would be automatically ruled out from getting *ṭak*.

But there arose another difficulty for Ptj. This modification in the Sūtra would be excluding also another form that was wanted, viz. *śaśa-ghnī-* f. "hare-killer", denoting an animate being like a bird (*śakuni-*) [466] as the agent, and still showing *ṭak*. As this form could thus be established by the present Sūtra in its unmodified form referring to a non-human agent (and even though there might be more forms of a different type in Ptj's usage), the thought of modifying the Sūtra must be abandoned and it must be accepted as it is. This is what Ptj finally did. (For, as he often says,[467] the sanctity of the Sūtra-wording must not be easily tampered with but be guarded as far as possible.)[468]

---

[465] Except as *pāṇi-rekhā-* noted at *pw* 4.64b to be from *MBhr* (but untraced).

[466] Ptj's usage also shows another form, *śakunikā-* (II.100.6), for which see Obsn **72** and fn. 302.

The form is recorded by Ptj as being a part of the usage, *śaśaghnī śakuniḥ* (II 104. 15). In literature, not *śaśa-ghnī-* but *śaśa-ghna-* is attested in *VarBS* (88. 1) probably in reference to a bird. As *śaśa-ghna-* can be derived by the rule of P, it is not unlikely that he or Kty had it in their usage. But that cannot be stated with certainty. (Even *śaśa-* is not found with P or Kty, thogh it occurs in the Veda.)

Obsn 117: (i) P did not use the form, *rāja-gha-*.

(ii) Both Kty and Ptj had it in their usage.

Among forms derived with the suffix *ṭak*,[469] P (3.2.55 : ***pāṇighatāḍaghau śilpini***) has enumerated two forms, ***pāṇi-gha-*** "one who strikes with the hand (i.e. one who plays upon a hand-instrument or a handicraftsman[470])" and ***tāḍa-gha*** "(probabably :) striking with palm-sticks (or with blows?)"[471], as extraordinary formations when denoting an artisan agent. On that, Kty has sought to add another extraordinary formation, ***rāja-gha-*** "a regicide, or slayer of a king".

Obviously, the condition of the agent being a skilful doer of an act (***Śilpin-***) is not intended to be present in the form; further, the first member here shows the object and not the instrument of the action of hitting (as in ***pāṇi-gha-*** and ***tāḍa-gha-***). In all probability, therefore, the form, ***rāja-gha-*** was not used by P. For, had he known or used it, he would have noted it as an irregular formation beside ***pāṇi-gha-*** and ***tāḍa-gha-*** which only he has specifically enumerated; it could have been in a seperate rule there than the one recording these two forms, as the condition '***śilpini***' did not probably apply toit. We can thus be definite on the point of the non-use of the irregular form, *rāja-gha-* in the time of P.

---

[467] Cp. *sūtraṁ tarhi bhidyate; yathā-nyāsam eva=astu.*

[468] As to how *nagara-ghāta-* was finally established by Ptj, refer to Obsn **147.**

[469] However, *KV* (178), but not *SK* 2972 (or *ŚabK* II.444) seeks to derive them with the suffix *ka.*

[470] According to *MW* 615.

[471] Cp. *tāḍa-* "a blow" in *AV* 19.32.2 where, however, according to G. V. DEVASTHALI, it "appears to be something like a hammer used for striking or beating (red-hot) iron in order to stretch it" (p. 202 from his "Prakritism in the *Ṛgveda,*" pp. 199-205, from *Proceedings of the Seminar in Prakrit Studies,* University of Poona, Poona, 1970). It means "one who strikes" in *Manu* (10.33 : *nṛn praśaṁsaty ajasraṁ yo ghaṇṭā-tāḍo 'ruṇodaye*). In the sense of "a toddy-palm", *tāla-* occurs in *Manu* (8.246), *Rām* and *MBhr,* and *tāḍa-* first probably only in *YCampū.*

This, thus, reflects development of a new formation by the the time of Kty, and retention of the same at the time of Ptj who is seen accepting the use of the form

In literature *rāja-gha-* is attested only in *Naiṣadh,* in the line, *rarāja nīrājanayā sa rājaghaḥ* (1.10)[472].

---

[472] See Mallinātha : *rājñaḥ — pratipakṣān iti bhāvaḥ — hanti=iti rāja-ghaḥ; śatru=ghātī=ity=arthaḥ.*

<< 11 >> FORMS IN A_7 (*ṬA*)

(Sūtra-s : 3.2. 16-23)

Obsn 118: (i) It is not known whether either P or Kty used the forms, *kuru-cara-* and *pañcāla-cara-*, indicatiag in them the location of the action.

(ii) Ptj had the forms in his usage.

Ptj probably had in his usage the forms, *kuru-cara-* "moving among the Kurus" and *pañcāla-cara-* "moving among the Pañālas". These were derived by the rule, *careṣ ṭaḥ* (3.2.16) (+ '*adhikaraṇe*', 3.2.15), which enjoined the suffix *ṭa* after √*car-* when it was preceded by a locational Upapada.

This usage of the time of Ptj is implied by the question put to him as to why the two forms, even when showing the same suffix *ṭa,* were not got with the Upapada-s carrying the objective sense. (*iha-kasmān na bhavati*, '*kurūñś carati*', '*phñcālāñś carati*'=*iti*? II. 101.2.).[473]

The form, *kuru-cara-*, is seen actually mentioned by Ptj as *kurucara-śabda* (II. 205.8) and within the usage, *bahu-kurucarā*[474] *mathurā* and *priya-kurcucarā*[474] *mathurā* (II. 205.7).

The two forms are not attested in literature.

Obsn 119 : P, Kty and Ptj, all, used the form, *bhikṣā-cara-*, in the object sense.

In the rule, *careṣ ṭaḥ* (3. 2. 16), there could be the presence (Anuvṛtti) either of the word '*karmaṇi*' handed down from the rule *karmaṇy aṇ* (3.2.1) or of the word '*adhikaraṇe*' from the preceding rule, *adhikaraṇe śeteḥ* (3. 2. 15). But, it is pointed out by Kty that the absence in *careṣ ṭaḥ* of the Anuvṛtti of '*karmaṇi*' is indicated by P's use of the objective Upapada '*bhikṣā-*' in the very next rule, *bhikṣā-senā=ādāyeṣu ca* (3. 2. 17).[475] Thus, he says, *carer bhikṣā-grahaṇaṁ jñāpakaṁ karmaṇy aprasaṅgasya* (3. 2. 16. 1).

---

[473] See Obsn **110.**

[474] Where being an Upasarjana within a compound, *kuru-cara-* cannot (by the rule, *anupasarjanāt*, 4.1.14) take the fem. suffix *ṅīp* enjoined by 4.1.15. But, the form, *kuru-cara*, by itself has, as its feminine, *kuru-carī-*, showing *ṅīp* after forms ending in a *ṭ-it* suffix.

[475] See Obsn **110.**

Kty's Vt, thus, purports to take cognisance of P's form *bhikṣā-cara-*, in the sense of *bhikṣāṁ carati* " one who wanders for (obtaining) [476] the alms" (or, " one practising an alms-round "?). From the argument of Kty, it seems obvious that P too understood the form with *bhikṣā-* as the objective Upapada to √*car-* with *ṭa*; and it is further implied that neither of them **bhikṣā-cāra-* from the objective Upapada *bhikṣā-* and √*car-* taking the suffix *aṇ* regularly by the *karmaṇy aṇ* (3. 2. 1) rule.

However, from this alone it may not be happy to conclude that Kty had noticed the form, *bhikṣā-cara-*, in the usage of his times. For, he can be understood to have simply tried to understand the framing of P's rules (3. 2. 16, 17) and the usages of P. Nevertheless, absence of any note from Kty differing from the usage of P, may be taken as an indication that he too had without objection retained the earlier usage of P.— The same can be said of Ptj.

The form is not attested in literature.

Obsn 120 : (i) P used the feminine forms, *kiṁ-karī-*, *yat-karī-*, *tat-karī-* and *bahu-karī-*, in the *Hetvādi* as well as the non- *Hetvādi* senses.

(ii) Kty and Ptj instead used *kiṁ-karā-*, *yat-karā-*, *tat-karā-* and *bahu-karā-* in the non-*Hetvādi* senses.

P (*kṛño hetu-tācchīlya=ānulomyeṣu*, 3.2.20) had enjoined the suffix *ṭa* after √*kṛ-* "to do" having a Karmopapada and when the resultant form showed purpose, habit or acquiescence of the doer; immediately next, he enjoined the same suffix after √*kṛ-* even when the resultant form did **not** show the above aspects and when √*kṛ-* was preceded by anyone from the specifically listed Upapada-s which showed, among others, *kim-*, *yad-*, *tad-* and *bahu-* (3.2.21). The suffix *ṭa* made the forms *īkārānta* in the feminine (with *ṅīp* by 4.1.15). That meant (1) that he used the forms, *kiṁ-kara-* m., °*rī-* f. "doing 'what?' (i.e. saying 'What shall I do? ', hence) a servant", *yat-kara-* m., °*rī-* f. "doing or undertaking which-in-relation", *tat-kara-* m., °*rī-* f. "doing that-in-relation or doing that particular work", and *bahu-kara-* m., °*rī-*f. "doing much, busy"; and (2) that he used these forms either when (by 3.2.20) the agent showed any purpose, habit or acquiescence (i.e. showed the *Hetvādi* senses), or when (by 3.2.21) the agent did not show these.

However, in this latter sense i.e. when the agent showed the non-*Hetvādi* senses, Kty (3.2.21.1) did **not** use the above four sets of forms (out of the twenty-seven enumerated by P at 3.2.21). He used instead *kiṁ-kara-* m.,

---

[476] See *PdM* (554) : *caratir atra tatpūrvake arjane vartate; caraṇena bhikṣām arjayati=iti arthaḥ.*

°*rā*- f., *yat-kara*- m., °*rā*- f., *tat-kara*- m., °*rā*- f., and *bahu-kara*- m., °*rā*- f., — the difference with him being in the feminine ending. He, therefore, ruled that after the Upapada-s, *kim*-, *yad*-, *tad*- and *bahu*-, √*kṛ*- should take the suffix *ac*, and not *ṭa* (3.1.21.1 : *kiṁ-yat-tad-bahuṣu kṛño* ' *j-vidhānam*)[377]; for *ac* can bring about in the feminine the *ākārānta* forms (with *ṭāp* by 4.1.4), and not *īkārānta* ones (with *ṅīp*).

Ptj's manner of explaining the Vt of Kty indicates that his usage agreed with that of Kty.

Of the eight forms, only *kiṁ-karī*- is attested in early literature (*MBhr* 4.19.24) and *kiṁ-kara*- in *Raghu* (2.35 : *avehi māṁ kiṁkaram aṣṭamūrteḥ*).

Addenda to << 11 >>

(Formations by the Sūtra 3.2.20.)

Obsn 121: (i) P and Kty possibly used the forms, *śrāddha-kara*- and *piṇḍa-kara*-.

(ii) Ptj certainly used them.

While illustrating the scope (Avakāśa) for the suffix *ṭa* (II.100.5f.), Ptj has given the forms, *śrāddha-kara*- " one habitually performing the ceremony in honour of the deceased ancestors" and *piṇḍa-kara*- "one habitually preparing a ball (of rice or some flour to be offered to the deceased ancestors)". There are formed by the rule, *kṛño hetu-tācchīlya*=*ānulomyeṣu* (3. 2. 20).

Looking to the very common nature of the ideas in them, it should appear that the forms might well have been used early in the times of P and Kty also. (*śrāddha*- is used twice by the P: 4. 3. 15, 5. 2. 85, and *piṇḍa*- once by Kty: 4. 1. 64. 1 and often in the Veda.) But we cannot be fully certain of that.

Neither of compounds is attested in literature.[478]

Obsn 122 : (i) It cannot be stated definitely whether P or Kty used the form **śaṁ-karī*-.

(ii) Kuṇaravāḍava and Ptj possibly imply that they used it.

P (*śami dhātoḥ saṁjñāyām*, 3. 2. 14) had laid down that when a root was preceded by the Upapada *śam*- and the compound was to denote a name, the

---

[477] *Ny* (558) puts this cleverly : *a-hetvādyarthatvāc ca*=*ārambhasya*, — *yadā hetvādayo viśeṣā na vivakṣyante tadā kiṁ-yat-tad-bahuṣu kṛño 'j-vidhānam; teṣu vivakṣiteṣu pūrvasūtreṇa ṭa eva bhavati.*

[478] *piṇḍa-kara*- is found attested early in *KauArth* (2.15.3), but that is in the entirely different sense of "an aggregate tax (by a village etc.)" (vide KANGLE, G1.49).

Kṛdanta member of it was to be formed with the suffix *ac*; and the feminine form in this case would be *ākārānta* (by 4. 1. 4). When, however, the form was not to be a name but to denote an agent with some habit etc., the Kṛdanta was to be formed with the suffix *ṭa* if the root was √*kṛ*–; and the feminine in this case would be *īkārānta* (by 4. 1. 15). (*kṛño hetu-tācchīlya=ānulomyeṣu*, 3.2.20).

These two rules of P gave rise to a doubt in the case when (from *śam*– and √*kṛ*–) the resultant fem. form denoted at the same time a name (establishing *śaṁ–karā*– with *ac* by 3. 2. 14 and *ṭāp*) as well as an agent with a habit (establishing *śaṁ–karī*– with *ṭa* by 3. 2. 20. and *ṅīp*). This is resolved by Kty (3. 2. 14. 1) and explained by Ptj there, stating that the form was to be only *śaṁ-karā*– with *ac* (and not *śaṁ-karī*– with *ṭa*); for, **that** according to them was the purpose of the use of the word '*dhātoḥ*' "after (any) root" by P at 3. 2. 14.

Now, this answer of Ptj bears another importance in that it implies the possibility of having a form in his usage derived from *śam*– and √*kṛ*– and that did **not** simultaneously denote a name and a habitual doer but that denoted **only** a habitual doer.[479] Such a form could be the adjective, **śaṁ–karī*– "(a woman) habitually doing good (to others)."

Further, the disagreement of Kuṇaravāḍava (quoted by Ptj there, II. 100. 8f.) with the correctness " of the form, *śaṁ–karā*–,[480] bears an implication that he also might have had the form, **śaṁ-karī*–, in his usage derived from *śam*– and √*kṛ*– in the habit sense.

As for P and Kty, however, it connot be said with certainty whether they did or did not have the form in their usage.

For the literary attestation of the form, fn. 304 on the Obsn **76** may be referred to.

---

[479] To illustrate the Avakāśa of *ṭa* (by 3.2.20) Ptj took the examples of *śrāddha-kara-* and *piṇḍa-kara-* but not of **śaṁ-karī-*, probably in the interest of clarity (by avoiding ambiguity with *śaṁ-karā-*).

[480] Refer to Obsn **72.**

<< 12 >> FORMS IN $-I_1$ (*IN*)

(Sūtra- s: 3. 2. 24-27)

Obsn 123 : (i) P used the forms, *stamba-kari-* and *śakṛt-kari-*, with reference to any or unspecified agents.

(ii) Kty used them in restricted contexts, and probably other forms in other contexts.

(iii) Ptj's usage agreed with that of Kty.

P had in his usage the forms, *stamba-kari-* " forming a clump or tuft of grass " and *śakṛt-kari-* "making ordure". So he derived them out of a Kṛdanta from √*kṛ-* (with the suffix *in*) and the Upapada-s, *stamba-* and *śakṛt-*, respectively. (*stamba-śakṛtor in*, 3. 2. 24.)

Kty too had these compound-forms in his usage, but as used in the restricted contexts only. Thus, he used *stamba-kari-* " forming sheaves " to refer only to rice, and *śakṛt-kari-* " dung-making " to refer only to a calf. (3. 2. 24. 1 : *stamba-śakṛtor vrīhi-vatsayoḥ.*)

From Kty's note it should appear that at the time of P the two forms were used in reference to any agent in general (*stamba-kari-*, to rice, wheat or else, and *śakṛt-kari-*, to a calf, cow, bull etc.), while by the time of Kty they referred only to the particular agents (*vrīhi-* and *vatsa-*) noted by him. Further, this ' sense-peculiarization ' by Kty should ordinarily imply that without that peculiarity Kty had in his usage other compound- forms formed out of the same components but with a different suffix. Actually, *KV* (173) does give the counter-formations, *stamba-kāra-* and *śakṛt-kāra*[481], that, be implication, did not possess in them the sense-peculiarity noted by Kty. (Thus, the first formation can refer to things like wheat, and the second one to animals like a cow, bullock, etc.) [482]

Absence of a negative or disagreeing statement from Ptj indicates that Kty's usage prevailed in his times as well.

None of the four forms is found attested in early literature. *śakṛt-kari-* probably first appears in *YCampū* (II. 185. 1), and *stamba-kari-* in *Harṣac*

---

[481] We cannot, however, be sure that these counter-forms were the same as those intended by Kty if at all, first obviously owing to the vast time-interval separating Kty and the authors of *KV*, and secondly as the suggested forms are **not** attested in early literature (cp. the *VWC Consolidated Indices* I. 717, 843).

[482] However, these other corresponding contexts are not stated by *KV*.

(225. 5) and later in the famous line from the *Mudrārākṣasa* (1. 3), *na śāleḥ stamba-kari-tā vaptur guṇam apekṣate.*

Obsn 124 : (i) P used an extraordinary formation, *ātma-ṁ-bhari-*.

(ii) Kty and Ptj used in addition *kukṣi-ṁ-bhari-* which is similiar in formation.

P had an extraordinary forms, *phale-grahi-* "bearing fruit" and *ātma-ṁ-bhari-* " self-nourishing, one who feeds (only) one's own self (i. e. selfish)", in his usage. So he noted them under forms showing the suffix *in*. (*phale-grahir ātma-ṁ-bhariś ca*, 3. 2. 26.)

But Kty had another form, *kukṣi-ṁ-bhari-* "filling or pampering (only one's own) belly (i. e. gluttonous or selfish)", current in contemporary speech. This form was similar in formation to *ātma-ṁ-bhari-*[483]. So he modified the Sūtra-reference to *ātma-ṁ-bhari-* into *bhṛñaḥ kukṣy-ātmanor mum ca* (3. 2. 26. 1).[484]

Ptj's usage seems to be agreeing with that of Kty. For, after explaining the formation of *āmaṁ-bhari-* (—see fn. 483—), he introduces the latter's Vt with the endorsing words, *atyalpam idam ucyate* (II, 101. 16f). For *ātma-ṁ-bhari* he supplies us even with the connected usage which is a metrical line.[485] *ātmaṁ-bhariś carati yūtham asevamānaḥ* (II. 102. 3.)

Now, although *kukṣi-* was well known to the Veda, and was even used thrice by P himself in his rules (4. 2. 96, 3. 56,6.2. 187), it is equally apparent that he did not have the form, *kukṣi-ṁ-bhari-*, in his usage. For, if the form had been before him, he would have certainly recorded it besides *ātma-ṁ-bhari-* as both showed the same kind of derivation. Thus, a sure history in the usage can be noted here.

In literature, *ātma-ṁ-bhari-tā-* is attested earliest probably in *Harṣac* (206. 11)[486] and *ātma-ṁ-bhari-tva-* in *Nāgānanda* (II. 0-1) and *KathāS* (26. 228, 53. 164);[487] *kukṣi-ṁ-bhari-* is found in *Kumāra* (15. 53).

---

[483] Viz. the suffix in and the extra-ordinary *mum-āgama*. See Ptj : *'ātmaṁ-bharir' iti kiṁ nipātyate ? ātmano mum, bhṛñaś ca=in-pratyayaḥ*. (II.101-16).

[484] On the three forms noted together by the Sūtra and the Vt, RENOU (see fn. 314 : I.185) remarks, obviously by oversight, that the irregularity in 'these words' ('ces mots') resides in the *aluk*. Actually, the *aluk* is here seen only in *phale-grahi-* (with respect to the locative case suffix): there being no *aluk* enjoined by P to the accusative case suffix, *ātmaṁbhari-* and *kukşiṁbhari-* cannot be viewed as examples of *aluk*.

[485] The metre is Vasanta-tilakâ. See KIELHORN : *IA* (1885) 14.326 from his "Quotations in the Mahâbhâshya and the Kâśikâ-Vṛitti".

[486] See also F. W. THOMAS, *JRAS* 1899, p. 490 from his "Two Lists of Words from Bāṇaś Harşa-Carita".

[487] According to *PW* 1.624 and 5.1098.

<<13>> FORMS IN A_8 (*KHAS*)

(Sūtra-s : 3.2.28-37,83)

Obsn 125 : (i) P may or may not be having in his usage the forms, *vāta-m-aja-*, *śuni-ṁ-dhaya-* and *tila-ṁ-tuda-*; he probably did not use the form, *śardha-ṁ-jaha-*.

(ii) Kty and Ptj had all the four in their usage.

P had derived some Upapada-compounds with the suffix *khaś* after roots in their Kṛdanta members. But Kty noted some more forms showing the same type of formation as brought about by the suffix *khaś*. (Being a *kh-it* the suffix shortens the final vowel of the Upapada, and brings in the *mum-āgama* or the nasal augment after the vowel-ending Upapada. [488]) So, at the outset of this section of P's rules ('*khaś-prakaraṇa*') he enumerated those. (3. 2. 28. 1 : *khaś-prakaraṇe vāta-śunī-tila-śardheṣv aja-dheṭ-tuda-jahātibhyaḥ.*)

These forms are : *vāta-m-aja-* " going or running (swiftly) like the wind", *śuni-ṁ-dhaya-* " sucking a female dog ", *tila-ṁ-tuda-* " sesamum-grinder (or an oilman)", and *śardha-ṁ-jaha-* " causing[489] the breaking wind to move (or generating gas in the alimentary canal), i. e. causing flatulence ".

Ptj approves of the use of the forms, and in the case of two supplies even the connected usages : *vātamajā mṛgāḥ* (II. 102 6f.), *śardhaṁjahā māṣāḥ* (II. 102. 8). This fact further indicates that the language of his times showed currency of even all the four forms.

The same cannot be said with equal certainty about the usage of P, although his rules (see fn. 488) can be theoretically understood to be deriving the forms. (Only *vāta-* and *tila-* are found used by P and Kty.)

None of the four compound forms is attested in literature.

Obsn 126 : (i) P used the forms, *nāsika-ṁ-dhama-*, *stana-ṁ-dhaya-*, *nāḍi-ṁ-dhama-* and *muṣṭi-ṁ-dhaya-*.

(ii) Kty used *muṣṭi-ṁ-dhama-* in addition.

---

[488] The vowel-shortening by *khity anavyayasya* (6.3.66), and the nasal augment by *arur-dviṣad-ajantasya mum* (6.3.67).

[489] It is probably the editor Pt. RAGHUNĀTHA ŚĀSTRĪ who remarks here : *jahātir antarbhāvita-ṇyarthaḥ* (*M*, NSP. ed., III.166a, fn. 3).

(iii) Ptj used these and, in addition, *nāsika-ṁ-dhaya-*, *nāḍi-ṁ-dhaya-*, *ghaṭi-ṁ-dhama-*, *ghaṭī-ṁ-dhaya-*, *khāri-ṁ-dhama-* and *khāri-ṁ-dhaya-*.

In connection with forms derived with the suffix *khaś*, P has framed two rules, *nāsikā-stanayor dhmā-dheṭoḥ* (3. 2. 29). and *nāḍī-muṣṭyoś ca* (3. 2. 30). BÖHTLINGK's remark (*PGr* 96) branding the latter Sūtra as spurious receives an answer first from Nāgeśa[490] and next from K. M. K. SARMA[491].

Normally, the technique for mutually relating the equal number of corresponding subjects of a grammatical operation is set out by P by the maxim, *yathāsaṁkhyam anudeśaḥ samānām* (1. 3. 10): this rule asks us to get the mutual correspondence (or assignment of each to each) according to their order of enumeration in the rule. — The maxim makes us understand P here as establishing by the above two rules the forms, *nāsika-ṁ-dhama-*[492] "blowing through the nose", "*stana-ṁ-dhaya-* "sucking the breast, a suckling, infant," *nāḍi-ṁ-dhama-* "swelling the veins (or causing a quicker pulse i. e. terrifying)" or "blowing through the tube, a goldsmith", and *muṣṭi-ṁ-dhaya-* "sucking the fist, an infant". [493] — That the '*yathāsaṁkhya*' maxim (1. 3. 10) is to be applied here is evident first from P's establishing the forms (not as **one** combined Sūtra but) by framing **two** Sūtra-s, when alone they could show the Saṁkhyātānudeśa. The fact is endorsed by Kty's specific statement (1. 3. 10. 24) [494] on the maxim about the *nāḍī*° rule. Thirdly, Ptj's simple paraphrasing (I. 271. 5) of that statement of Kty indicates that he too approved of what Kty had stated. [495] By the same state-ment, the Saṁkhyātānudeśa in the immediately preceding rule, *nāsikā*° (3. 2. 29), is also obviously implied. when, further, Kty asks us to connect *stana-* with *dheṭ* (*stane dheṭaḥ*, 3. 2. 29. 1), he again implies that the other two subjects from the same rule, viz. *nāsikā-* and *√dhamā-*, be also automatically connected by the Saṁkhyātānudeśa maxim.

---

[490] .....*naitāvatā 'tat-sūtram* (i.e. 3.2.30) *aprāmāṇikam' iti bhramaḥ kāryaḥ. 'yathā-saṁkhya'-sūtra-stha-bhāṣye spaṣṭaṁ tatsūtropādānāt.* (166b).

[491] *JUPHS* (1940) 13.57f. from his "The Text of the Aṣṭādhyāyī."

[492] Where *dhmā-* is substituted by *dhama-* before a *ś-it* suffix by 7.3.78. For the vowel-shortening, see fn. 488 on Obsn **125.**

[493] It would have been difficult for P to combine the two rules into one; for, in that case there would have been a disparity between the corresponding numbers of subjects, the Upapada-s being four and the roots being only two. Further, a kind of symmetry is shown in the nature of the corresponding Upapada-s of the two rules : the former rule giving at their end a long vowel of the *a*-type followed by a short one (*nāsikā-* and *stana-*), and the next rule giving at their end a long vowel of the *i*-type followed by a short one (*nāḍī-* and *muṣṭi-*).

[494] Viz. Because the two sets of corresponding subjects are to appear in one and the same rule in order to be governed by the *yathāsaṁkhya* maxim (*'samānyayoga-vacanāt'* from 1.3.10.22), the wanted Saṁkhyātānudeśa in the rule, *nāḍī-muṣṭyoś ca* (3.2.30), cannot be had in the absence of an explicit utterance of *dhmā-dheṭoḥ* (from 3.2.29) in that rule.

[495] But see fn. 498.

Thus, Kty, shows that he had in his usage the forms, *nāsika-ṁ-dhama-* and *stana-ṁ-dhaya-*.

On the next (i. e. *nāḍī-muṣṭi°*) rule, Kty says that (besides *dheṭ*) *√dhmā-* should "also" ('*ca*') be connected with *muṣṭi* - (*muṣṭau dhmaś ca*, 3. 2. 29. 2, which should rather be 3. 2. 30. 1 [496]). [497] - That means that in Kty's usage the forms, *nāḍi-ṁ-dhama-* and *muṣṭi-ṁ-dhaya-*, were already current as established according to the Saṁkhyātānudeśa, and that to them was to be added *muṣṭi-ṁ-dhama-* "blowing through the (hollow) fist [498]." This makes it obvious that by the time of Kty, a new form, *muṣṭi-ṁ dhama-*, was developed in the usage.[499]

By the time of Ptj the picture of the usage was much broadened in respect of the *dhama-* ending and *dhaya-*ending Upapada-compounds. *nāsikā-* and *nāḍī-* which were previously connected only with *√dhmā-* (giving *nāsika-ṁ-dhama-* and *nāḍi-ṁ-dhama-*) were then connected also with *dheṭ* (giving *nāsika-ṁ-dhaya-* "drinking through the nose" and *nāḍi-ṁ-dhaya-* sucking through a tube" [500]). Thus, his usage contained the forms : *nāsika-ṁ-dhama-*, *nāsika-ṁ-dhaya-*; *nāḍi-ṁ-dhama, nāḍi-ṁ-dhaya-*; *muṣṭi-ṁ-dhama-*, *muṣṭi-ṁ-dhaya-*. Not only that; in addition, it also showed : *ghaṭi-ṁ-dhama-* "a pot-blower (or a potter)", *ghaṭi-ṁ-dhaya* "one who drinks a pitcherful"; *khārī-ṁ-dhama-*" blowing the *khārī-*(measure of grain, probably to remove dust inside),"

---

[496] Cp. NBh (166ab) : *'muṣṭau dhmaś ca='iti vārttikaṁ 'nāḍī-muṣṭyoś ca='iti paṭhita-sūtrasya vyavasthāpakam eva.*

[497] Cp. NBh (166b) : *evaṁ cātra, 'nāḍī-'śabdena 'dhma' eva saṁbandho, 'muṣṭi-' śabdena=ubhayor, iti bodhyam.*

[498] However, the scholiasts onward from the authors of *KV* see in the two rules non-application of the *yathāsaṁkhya* maxim. Thus : *KV* (174), *Ny* (563), *PdM* (l.c.), Kaiy 166a, ŚabK (II. 437) and NBh. The last one writes : (on I.271.5) *idaṁ tṛīyādhyāyasthabhāṣya-virodhād ekadeśi-vacanam* (II.144b); and *yady api nāḍī-muṣṭi-viṣaye tat-sūtre* (i.e. on 1.3.10 at 1.3.10.24, i.e. at I.271.5) *yathāsaṁkhyam uktaṁ, tathā 'py etad-bhāṣya-vārttika-virodhāt tad bhāṣyaṁ* (i.e. at I.271.5) *prauḍhi-vāda iti bodhyam* (166b). *ŚabK* (II.437) tries to resolve the so-called discrepancy in *M* by supposing "the (presence of) differing views" (*tan mata-bhedena bodhyam*). — In the first place, both, the so-called *virodha* in *M* and the nonapplicability of the Saṁkhyātānudeśa in the two rules, are not clear and convincing. And secondly, the arguments of the scholiasts providing their thesis are entirely unhistorical.

[499] K. M. K. SARMA's doubt (l.c., 58) about P's knowledge (rather, ignorance) of the form, *muṣṭi-ṁ-dhama-*, is not understandable.

[500] The instrument-sense in these forms as well as in *nāsika-ṁ-dhama-* and perhaps in *nāḍi-ṁ-dhama-* may be noted.

khāri-ṁ-dhaya- "drinking with the *khārī-* (measure of grain, i. e. so plentifully).[501] So he writes, *atyalpam* "*idam*" (i. e. "(only) *muṣṭau*" in relation to '*dhmaś ca*' from *muṣṭau dhmaś ca* of Kty) *ucyate*; '*nāsikā-nāḍī-muṣṭi-ghaṭi-khārīṣv*[502] *iti vaktavyam*. (II. 102. 14) (Of the two new Upapada-s, *ghaṭī-* is found used by Kty at 3. 2. 9. 1, and *khārī-* by P at 5. 1. 33, 5. 4. 101.)

In literature, *nāsika-ṁ-dhama-*, *nāsika-ṁ-dhaya-*, *muṣṭī-ṁ-dhama-*, *nāḍi-ṁ-dhaya-*, *ghaṭi-ṁ-dhama-*, *khāri-ṁ-dhama-* and *khāri-ṁ-dhaya-* (or *khari-ṁ-dhama-* and *khari-ṁ-dhaya-*) are not attested. Of others, *stana-ṁ-dhaya-* occurs[502a] in *ChBr* (1. 1. 12), in the Kāvya literature (*Raghu* 14. 78 etc. and in *MārkP* (35. 14): *muṣṭi-ṁ-dhaya-* in the *Jānakīharaṇa* (10. 17) and *Padyacū* (2. 42);[503] and *nāḍi-ṁ-dhama-* in the *Kādambarī* (2. 196. 17),[504] *Haravijaya* (25. 23.)[505] etc.

Obsn 127 : (i) P had *manya*-ending compounds in his usage, in the sense of "supposing about oneself"; but the position of the accent in those is not known with certainty.

(ii) Ptj, and perhaps even Kty, also had them, with the accent on the final syllable.

P had enjoined after √*man-* (*manaḥ* 3. 2. 82) preceded by a Subantopapada the suffix *khaś*, when the agent qualified by the compound-form carried the sense of '*ātma-māna*' (*ātma-māne khaś ca* 3. 2. 83). With the suffix *khaś*, the Kṛdanta component of the compound was got as *manya-*[506] and the *mum-āgama* was had after the preceding vowel-ending component[507]. (E. g.

---

[501] The authors of *KV* (174), however, try to show as usual how establishment of these additional forms (not expressed in the rules of P) are implied by the '*ca*' in the rule, 3.2.30 ("*anukta-samuccayārthaś cakāraḥ*"). See KIELHORN, 16.251f.

[502] V. 1. *kharīṣu*, which is accepted by *KV* and *PdM*; BhD records it as a v.l. in *ŚabK* (937), and accepts both the forms side by side in his Vt at *SK* (2945). — *khari-ṁ-dhama-* and *khari-ṁ-dhaya-* would mean respectively : "setting fire to a she-ass (?)" and "sucking a she-ass".

[502a] It is perhaps anticipated in the line, *imaṁ stanam ūrjasvantaṁ dhayāpām*) *VS* 17.87, *TS* 5.5.10.6). See V. P. LIMAYE, *CSM*, p. 446.

[503] On this word, reference may be further made to : (i) T. VENKATACHARYA, "The Significance of the Expression *muṣṭiṃdhaya*," *ALB* (1971) 35.172-80 (also : pp. 723-30 from *Kshetresa Chandra Chattopadhyaya Feli. Vol.*, Pt. 2, i.e. *JGJKSV*, Jan.-April 1972, 28: 1-2); (ii) K. K. RAJA, "Muṣṭiṃdhaya," *ALB* 35. 181-88.

[504] According to *pw* 3.192b.

[505] The Commentator Rājānaka Alaka writes : *nāḍīm agnyuttejanāya yo dhamati sa nāḍi-n-dhamaḥ, suvarṇakārādiḥ*. (p. 318f.)

[506] *khaś* being a *ś-it* is a *Sārvadhātuka* suffix by 3.4.113. A *Sārvadhātuka* suffix is preceded by *yak* (3.1.67) or by the conjugational affixes i.e. Vikaraṇa-s (3.4.68 etc.). Hence, √*man-* + *yak*/*śyan* gives *manya-*.

[507] By 6.3.67.

darśanīya-ṁ-manya- "thinking oneself to be handsome", *paṇḍita-ṁ-manya-* "thinking oneself learned.")

The sense of '*ātma-māna*' has been determined to be "a thought or supposition about oneself" and the compound is made possible by the rule, *kṛdyogā ca* (2. 2. 8. 1). Its expansion gives '*ātmanaḥ mānam*' where '*ātmanaḥ*' shows an objective genitive. That the sense is that of an objective genitive and not one of a subjective genitive when both are possible[508] is clear from the specific mention of the word '*ātman*' in the Sūtra. ' (*ātmagrahaṇa-sāmarthyāt* ...., II. 110. 9f.)[509]

Next a discussion is carried by Ptj whether it was still necessary to add the note '*karma-kartari ca*' (printed as : 3. 2. 83. 1.)[510] on the Sūtra and to understand the compound with ***manya-*** as a passive-like construction (***karma-vadbhāva** by karmavat karmaṇā tulya-kriyaḥ* 3. 1. 87) with *yak,* instead of as a form got with the *vikaraṇa śyan* (3. 1. 69). It was concluded that either *yak* or *śyan* made no accentual difference in *manya-* that was feared, and that either way the accent was seen as *manyá-*. The conclusion has emanated from Ptj's generalisation (III. 100. 9–11)[511] based on an observation by Kty made elsewhere (6. 1. 158. 11).[512]

For the purpose of linguistic history, this conclusion, as well as the way it was arrived at, are the only important outcomes of the discussion. Thus,

(1) Ptj had in his usage compound-forms ending in *manya-*;

(2) those forms bore the accent on the final syllable; and

(3) this was probably true of Kty's usage also, as Ptj's generalisation

---

[508] By *kartṛ-karmaṇoḥ kṛti,* 2.3.65.

[509] If it were a subjective genitive, then that idea could be got even without the use of the word *ātman-*, as the act of thinking is invariably carried on by the subject himself; and then its use in the Sūtra would be superfluous. See *Ny* (600) : *na hy ātmano 'nyasya padārthasya matiḥ saṁbhavati, tasyā ātmaguṇatvāt;* and Kaiy (175b) : *kartṛsaṁbandhāvyabhicārān mananakriyāyāḥ.*

[510] In this first edition of *M* (1883) KIELHORN had printed this as a Vt of Kty. **But later,** he rejected its claim to be such. See *IA* (1886) 15.205, from his "On some doubtful Vârttikas". Unfortunately, however, the text in the second edition (1906) does not show this correction, and the same is continued in the third edition (1965).

[511] *yad ayaṁ* (i.e. P) *tāseḥ parasya la-sārvadhātukasya=anudāttatvaṁ* (6.1.186) *śāsti, taj jñāpayaty ācāryaḥ* (i.e. P) *"sati śiṣṭo 'pi vikaraṇa-svaro la-sārvadhātuka-svaraṁ na bādhata" iti.*

[512] *syādisvarāprasaṅgaś ca tāseḥ parasya=anudātta-vacanāt.*

was based on Kty ' s observation noted above[513] — However, beyond the ***mum-āgama*** brought before ***manyá-*** by the suffix ***khaś***, we have no knowledge of the types of the preceding component in the compound.

As for P, we cannot be definite about the position of the accent that he had on *manya-*.

The compound-forms, *darśanīya-ṁ-manya-* and *paṇḍita-ṁ-manya-*, cited in *KV* (183) are not easily attested in literature; the latter form occurs late[514] in the *Prabodha-Candrodaya* (II. 3-, p. 54).

---

[513] However, whether also Kty, as Ptj has interpreted him, intended by his Vt (6.1.158.11) to get the **unqualified or broad** (*aviśeṣeṇa*) indication from P (— by making not only the accent on the *la-sārvadhātuka* suffix but even that on **any** *sārvadhātuka* suffix like *khaś* here, more powerful than the *satiśiṣṭa vikaraṇa-svara* like *śyan* —) is not definitely known. It is only Ptj who makes the authoritative statement on behalf of Kty. See the doubt-raising and the reply : *"la-sārvadhātuka etaj jñāpakaṁ syāt — ?" "na"=ity āha; "aviśeṣeṇa jñāpakam"*. (II.110.15f.)

[514] Though much earlier the Upaniṣads (cf. the *Kaṭhapaniṣad* 2.5) seems to anticipate it at *avidyāyām antare vartamānāḥ* (or *veṣṭyamānāḥ*) *svayaṁdhīrāḥ paṇḍitaṁmanyamānāḥ*. I owe this suggestion to V. P. LIMAYE.

<< 14 >> FORMS IN $-A_9$ (*KHAC*)

(Sūtra-s: 3. 2. 38-47)

Obsn 128: (i) P did not use the form, *mita-ṁ-gama-*, or any other form derived from a Subantopapada, √*gam-* and the suffix *khac*.

(ii) Kty used such forms; but whether he used *mita-ṁ-gama-* is not known for certain.

(iii) Ptj used *mita-ṁ-gama-* and such other forms.

By means of a few rules beginning with *priya-vaśe vadaḥ khac* (3. 2. 38), P derived Kṛdanta compounds showing Karmopapada-s, with the suffix *khac*. (Thus, *priya-ṁ-vada-* " speaking kind (words)", *vaśa-ṁ-vada-* " declaring submission, obedient " .) Kty saw in his usage such compounds derived with the same suffix after √*gam-*[515] preceded by a Subantopapada. So, at the outset of that section of P's rules (*khac-prakaraṇa*), he added a note deriving such forms (3.2.38. 1: *khac-prakaraṇe gameḥ supy upasaṁkhyānam*).

What exactly were such forms, current in Kty's usage, is not known; but from Ptj's illustration of the Vt ,we know that at least in Ptj's usage there was the form, *mita-ṁ-gama-* " moving with measured (steps) i. e. slowly " used in the phrase, *mitaṁgamā hastinī* (II. 102. 20). (*mita-* is used at 3.2.3.4 and 6.2.170 by P, and at 3.2.180. 1 by Kty.)

The form is not attested in literature.

Obsn 129: (i) P did not use the forms, *viha-ṁ-gama-* and *viha-ṁ-ga*.

(ii) Kty and Ptj had them in their usage.

Among the Kṛdanta compounds noticed in his usage by Kty (3.2.38.1), that were formed with the suffix *khac* after √*gam-* having Subantopapada-s, he specially noted the forms, *viha-ṁ-gama-* and *viha-ṁ-ga* " moving in the sky, sky-goer, (hence:) a bird ".[516] To establish these, the *viha* in them was derived by him from *vihāyas-* " the sky " (3. 2. 38. 2: *vihāyaso viha ca*). Further, the *ṭi*-portion (*'am'* in *gam-*) in these was seen to be optionally dropped before the suffix; so it was suggested by him to make the suffix *khac* that was added here, optionally a *ḍ-it* (3. 2. 38. 3: *khac ca ḍid vā*), when it could optionally bring about the *ṭi-lopa.*[517]

---

[515] If it were the earlier suffix *khaś*, √*gam-*, before a *ś-it* suffix like that, would have changed to *gacch* by the rule, *iṣu-gami-yamāṁ chaḥ* (7.3.77).

[516] *vihāyasā gacchati*, according to *KV* (175).

As Ptj has no objection to the establishment of these forms, the forms must be current at his time as well. As for P, however, it has to be observed that the forms were not current in usage of his times, as they are not derived by any of his rules.

The forms are not attested in the Veda, but they are used in *Manu* (1.39, 9. 55) and are of frequent occurrence in the Epics and later literature.

---

[517] By *ṭeḥ* (6.4.143).

<< 15 >> FORMS IN A_{10} (*ḌA*)

(Sūtra-s : 3. 2. 48-50)

Obsn 130 : (i) P did not use at all the forms, *sarvatra-ga-*, *panna-ga-*, *ura-ga-*, *nir-ga-*, *viha-ga-*, but possibly he did use the forms, *su-ga-* and *dur-ga-*.

(ii) Kty and Ptj had all of these in their usages.

The non-conventional (*a-saṁjñā*)[518] compound-forms, containing a Kṛdanta from √*gam-* and some seven Karmopapada-s, were derived by P with the suffix *ḍa*,[519] by the rule, *antātyantā°* (3. 2. 48). Kty noted from his usage a few more forms showing Upapada-s (not necessarily Karmopapada-s) other than those noted by P but which could be derived the same way (i. e. with *ḍa* after √*gam-*). So he added them by means of a few Vārttika-s on this rule of P. All of them are found noted by Ptj without objection; that shows that those were acceptable in his usage as well.

To start with, Kty has added *sarvatra-ga-* " going everywhere, (hence:) all-pervading, omni-present "[520] and *pannaga-* " going by having fallen down i. e. creepingly (or close to the ground)".[521] (3. 2. 48. 1: *ḍa-prakaraṇe sarvatra-pannayor upasaṁkhyānam.*) The first form occurs in *MBhr* (3. 2. 111 etc.) and *Manu* (9. 321.) (=*MBhr* 5. 15. 32); the second one, in *Rām* (6. 40. 35) and *MBhr* (1. 206. 18), and as *panna-gī-* in *Rām* (6. 24. 33).

Next, *ura-ga-* " moving on (lit. with) breast, (hence :) a serpent"[522] is derived by pointing out the loss of *s* from the Upapada *uras-*. (3. 2. 48. 2 ; *uraso lopaś ca.*) —The form is attested in *MBhr* (6. 33. 15=*BGītā* 11. 15) and *Manu*.

Then are added, in the locational sense,[523] the two forms, *su-ga-* " on

---

[518] The conventional (Saṁjñā) compound-forms with a Kṛdanta from √*gam-* and any Subantopapada are derived with the suffix *khac* by *gamaś ca* (3.2.47).

[519] The *ḍ-it* suffix *ḍa* causes the *ṭi-lopa* in √*gam-* by 6.4.143, and the resultant Kṛdanta is had as *ga-*.

[520] See *Ny* (573) : *sarvatra-śabdaś cātra 'supi'=ityanena saṁbadhyate.*

[521] See *Ny* (l.c.) : *panna-śabdaḥ kriyāviśeṣaṇatvāt 'karmaṇy'=ityanena saṁbadhyate;* and further (p. 191 on 2.3.33) : *kriyāyāḥ sādhyatvāt karmatvam; tad-viśeṣaṇam api karma bhavati.*

[522] Cp. *KV* (177) : *urasā gacchati=iti.*

[523] In the objective sense, the forms will be had as *su-gama-* and *dur-gama-* respectively and derived by *īṣad-dus-suṣu kṛcchrākṛcchrārtheṣu khal* (3.3.126).

[524] Cp. *KV* (l.c.) : *sukhena gacchaty asminn iti,*

(i. e. by) which one can go (lit. one goes) easily (or with ease), i. e. easy to go or pass on, or passable "[524] and *dur-ga-* " on which one goes with difficulty, or difficult to go on, impassable." (3. 2. 48. 3: *su-duror adhikaraṇe.*) Now, both these forms are found to occur in the Vedic literature. (Cf. *kṛṇōti víśvā supáthā sugā́ni RV* 6. 64. 1; *śá no bodhi puraetā́ sugéṣūtá durgéṣu pathikṛ́d vídānaḥ RV* 6. 21. 12.) P was, therefore, obviously aware of them. Still he has not derived them; and the cause of this must be that, although carrying the uncommon locational sense, they were too simple and common in the usage of his times. Kty's note does not restrict their occurrence to the Veda; that indicates that he was not pointing out P's lapse to note their occurrence in the Veda, but that he was referring to the forms as current in the usage of his own times. Of the two forms, *dur-ga-* is found to occur in *MBhr* (1.111.8) and *Manu* (11. 238), and *suga-* only in *KathāS* (39. 15)[525].

Lastly on this Sūtra, Kty notes the form, *nir-ga-*, to be referring to a spot or a region. (3. 2. 48. 4 : ***niso deśe.***) It, therefore, meant " (probably, spreading out or extensively, hence:) an open land or region ".[526] The form is not attested in literature.

Of the Upapada-s used, *sarvatra-* and *uras-* are often found with P .

On an earlier Sūtra, where he adds forms derived with the suffix *khac* after √*gam-* having Subantopapada-s, Kty includes a form, *viha-ga-* " going by the sky, a bird ", and derives it with the suffix *ḍa.*[528] The form is not known to the Veda, but is quite common in the Epics.

---

[525] According to *PW* 7.1042.

[526] It may be incidentally noted that *'adhikaraṇe'* of 3.2.48.3 and *'deśe'* of 3.2.48.4 are not analogous in their significance; otherwise, if the former included the latter, there was no need for the latter's separate mention. Hence *'adhikaraṇe'* refers to the case of what is expressed by the forms, *su-ga-* and *dur-ga-;* while *'deśa'* refers to the meaning of the resultant form, *nir-ga-*.

[527] The purpose of his adding the form on that Sūtra (deriving forms with *khac*) is only economy, by getting extended from the previous Vt-s (3.2.38.2, 3) the substitution of *viha* for *vihāyas-;* otherwise, had he noted *viha-ga-* in a fifth Vt on the present Sūtra (3.2.48), he would have been required to repeat here the instruction about the substitution.

[528] KIELHORN has wrongly understood the derivation of this form as given by Kaiy (167a) by means of the rule, *anyeṣv api dṛśyate,* which obviously stands for the Vt of 'Apara' on 3.2.48, *ḍa-prakaraṇe 'nyeṣv api dṛsyate.* KIELHORN has supposed it to be the Sūtra, *anyeṣv api dṛśyate* (3.2.101), and recorded it so in the footnote on *viha-ga-* here in his edition. (The same is continued without a note of correction in the third edition of the text published in 1965.) But the rule 3.2.101 derives forms in general with *ḍa* from the root √*jan-;* and although Ptj wanted to add on it *anyebhyo 'pi [dhātubhyaḥ] dṛśyate* (II.112.20), the section of P's rules there is governed by the significance of the past (*bhūte* 3.2.84).

Jinendrabuddhi has clearly mentioned the Vt of 'Apara', for deriving *viha-ga-* that is noted by Kty on P's rule about the suffix *khac* : *"na punar atra ḍa-pratyayaḥ — ?" "asmād eva vacanād bhavati; atha vā vakṣyaty uttarataḥ 'ḍa-prakaraṇe 'nyeṣv api dṛśyate' iti."* (*Ny* 567.)

Obsn 131 : (i) P did not derive the forms, *stryagāra-ga-* and *gurutalpa-ga-*, and even *grāma-ga-*.

(ii) Kty too did not derive any of these; it is possible that at least the last two were in the making at his time.

(iii) 'Apara' noted, occurring in the usage of his time, a large number of *ga*-endig forms and possibly the three forms noted by Ptj.

(iv) Ptj had in use at his time the three forms and perhaps many more.

It has been that on P's rule (3. 2. 48), deriving some seven Upapada-compound forms containing a Kṛdanta (*ga-*) with the suffix *ḍa* after √*gam-*, Kty added seven more similar forms by means of five Vārttika-s. —However, it appears that later on this sort of formation (a *ga*-ending Upapada-compound) became very popular in speech; so much so, that the original rule of P bringing about such formations had to be left completely open in order to account for all sorts of new formations of the type. This job of extending the sanction to them was left to one grammarian referred to as 'Apara' and quoted by Ptj as remarking *ḍa-prakaraṇe' nyeṣv api* (*upapadeṣu*) *dṛśyate* (II. 103. 14). this Obviously, 'Apara' must have lived after Kty and before Ptj.

This newly expanded rule is illustrated by Ptj with three examples, all in connected usages: *stryagāra-ga-* "aproaching or visiting a woman's apartment" from *tataḥ*[529] *stryagāragaḥ*; *grāma-ga-* "one going to a village" from *aśnute yāvadannāya grāmagaḥ* and *gurutalpa-ga-* "one who visits the bed of (one's) teacher i. e. has illicit relations with the teacher's wife)" from *dhvaṁsate gurutalpagaḥ* (II. 103. 15).

Of the three forms, the last one *gurutalpa-ga-*, is found to occur in *TĀr* (10.64, ed. R. MITRA, p. 920) which was probably later than P, *GDhSū* (21.1, 23.9), *MBhr* (3.186.42, 12.155.6, 13.90.10) and *Manu* (five times), and may be suspected to be in the making at the times of *Nir* (referring to *talpārohaṇa-* 6.27) and *ChUP* (referring to *guros talpam āvasan* 5.10.9).

It is, therefore, strange that Kty did not have it in his times, though he is understood by Ptj to be deriving *gaurutalpika-* (II. 329. 10). by his Vt, *gacchatau paradārādibhyaḥ* (4. 4. 1.4). Further, it has to be noted that a form like *grāma-ga-*, that appears so simple (and common, to Ptj and perhaps also to the earlier 'Apara'), was not (?) current at the time of P or even of Kty; it is not attested in literature also. (*agāra-* is used twice by P at 3. 3. 79 and 4.4. 70, but *talpa-* is not found with P or Kty.)

---

[529] It seems doubtful whether this '*tataḥ*' forms part of the quotation or is a word from Ptj introducing the three usages and meaning "by that (widened rule)".

However, the limitations of evidence both from the grammarians' rules and from literary attestation make us conclude that Kty's usage did not contain this form-type.

Addenda to << 15 >>

(Formation by the Vārttika 3. 2. 3. 1.)

Obsn 132 : (i) P probably did not use the forms, *āhva-*, *prahva-* (" loud-caller ") or *brahma-jya-* nor even **āhuva-*, **prahuva-* or **brahma-jiya-*).

(ii) Kty possibly used *āhva-* and *brahma-jya-*.

(iii) A scholiast who was perhaps a close predecessor or Ptj used at least *āhva-*.

(iv) Ptj used the three forms.

When P laid down the suffix *ka* after ā-ending roots preceded by an Upasarga (by *ātaś copasarge*, 3.1.136), he seems to have theoretically derived the form **āhuva-*[530] from *ā-* √*hve-*. Further; when he laid down the same suffix after ā-ending roots not preceded by an Upasarga but having the Karmopapada (by *āto 'nupasarge kaḥ*, 3.2.3), he seems to be deriving the form **brahma-jiya-*[531] from *brahman* + √*jyā-*. But such and the like forms from *samprasāraṇin* roots were not found in the usage by Kty. He probably saw instead forms like *āhva-* " caller, crier " and *brahma-jya-* " oppressing the brahmins " derived from the same units. So he laid down application of the suffix *ḍa* (instead of the *ka* laid down by P) in all such cases (3. 2. 3. 1 : *ka-vidhau sarvatra prasāraṇibhyo ḍaḥ*) : for, this *ḍa* gave the wanted forms. [532]

---

[530] The *e of* √*hve-* is changed to *ā* by *ād eca upadeśe 'śiti*, 6.1.45. (So *hve* > *hvā*.) The root, being a *yajādi*, takes the *saṁprasāraṇa* before a *k-it* suffix by *vaci-svapi-yajādīnāṁ kiti ca*. (So *hvā* + *ka* > *huā* + *ka*.)
Then, the *pūrva-rūpa hu* for *huā* by *saṁprasāraṇāc ca*, 6.1.108. (So *huā* + *ka* > *hu* + *a*.)
Then, *uvaṅ-ādeśa* by *aci śnu-dhātu-bhruvāṁ yvor iyaṅ-uvaṅau*, 6.4.77. (So *hu* + *a* > *huv* + *a* = *huva*.)

[531] The root takes the *saṁprasāraṇa* before a *k-it* or *ṅ-it* suffix by *grahi-jyā*⁰ .... 6.1.16. (So *jyā* + *ka* > *jiā* + *ka*.)
Then, the *pūrva-rūpa ji* for *jiā* by 6.1.108. (So *jiā* + *ka* > *ji* + *ka*.)
Then, *iyaṅ-ādeśa* by 6.4.77. (So *ji* + *a* > *jiy* + *a* = *jiya*.)

[532] By causing *ṭi-lopa* in the roots before a *ḍ-it* suffix by *ṭeḥ*, 6.4.143. (So *jyā* + *ḍa* > *jy* + *a* = *jya*; *hvā* + *ḍa* > *hv* + *a* = *hva*.)

Now what was Kty's intention to say by the word '*sārvatra*' he used (**on** 3. 2. 3) ? That is explained by Ptj : *anyatrāpi*; *nāvaśyam ihaiva* (i. e. not necessarily : only in the example (like) *brahmajyaḥ*). *kvānyatra*? *āhvaḥ prahva iti*. (II. 96. 15.) NBh on this says that it is the two **whole rules** (**3. 2. 3 and 3. 1. 136**) respectively at the base of two types of forms, that are meant here (and not that: only the **particular forms** mentioned by Ptj and derived by the two respective rules are to be understood.)[533] Hence, the Vt is understood to derive bare but *sopasarga* Kṛdanta-s as well as Upapada-compounds containing no Upasarga.

Thus, Ptj's expansion of Kty's **general** statement, illustrated with examples, implies that Kty used the forms, *āhva-*, *prahva-* (from *pra-√hve-*)[534] and *brahma-jya-* (or at least, forms like these).

And, Ptj's whole discussion, that accepts Kty's point but rejects the need of his Vt on the basis of a subtle grammatical interpretation of P, shows that the above forms that he took as example to illustrate Kty's Vt were found in his own usage. Ptj also refers illustratively to the ' wrong ' form, * *āhuva-*, theoretically resulting if the suffix *ka* laid down by P (3.1. 136) were accepted instead of the *ḍa* suggested by Kty (*āhuva ity etad rūpaṁ syāt*, II. 96. 18). This shows that he did not use, and assumed that Kty too did not use, the form **āhuva-*, nor, by implication, the forms, **prahuva-* and **brahmajiya-*.—Further, a Saṅgraha-śloka, given by Ptj at the end of his long theoretical discussion, also mentions the form *āhva-*; and, if the scholiast who was its author were to be looked·upon as one different from and (so) anterior to Ptj [535] (but of course posterior to Kty), then at least *āhva-* must be said to be older than Ptj.

Now, looklng for a usage before P, it is found that in the Veda not only *āhva-* (*KauSū* 16. 14) but also *āhúva-* (*āhúvaḥ*, *RV* 8. 32. 19) is used. The former is explained by the commentator Dārila (p. 42) as *palāśa-* or the tree Butea Frondosa, and the latter by Sāyaṇa as *āhvātavya-* " to be invoked ".

---

[533] According to him (159a), the '*sarvatra*' of Kty implies "wherever the (kṛt) suffix *ka* is enjoined" (*ka-mātre ity arthaḥ*); and so in Ptj's explanation of it, '*anyatrāpi*' means to him "also in the case of the rule, *ātaś copasarge* (3.1.136)" (and of course, NBh implies that Ptj's '*nāvaśyam ihaiva*' means "not necessarily : only in the case of the present rule, *āto 'nupasarge kaḥ* (3.2.3)").

[534] In the sense of "loud invokers"; but as commonly found used in (even early) literature in the sense of "inclined forward, bent, modest," *prahva-* has to be derived from *pra-√hvṛ-* with the suffix *ḍa* by Ptj's *anyebhyo 'pi dṛśyata iti vaktavyam* (II.112.20) on 3.2.101. See also V. P. LIMAYE, *CSM*, p. 193.

[535] See fn. 195 : p. 233 — "...I can discover no reason why the verses spoken of* should likewise not be regarded rather as the source of the arguments which Patañjali is propounding in his prose than as summaries, repeating, for the benefit of an inattentive student, those arguments in verse." (*I.e. "the *Saṁgraha-ślôkas*, or summary verses" which he is discussing.)

Further, *prahva-*(recorded at *USū* 1.151) is found used in the sense of " bent " in *AiBr* (3.9), *BD* (5. 76, 8. 5) and in the Gṛhya and Śrauta Sūtra-s, and *brahma-jya-* in *AV* and *TBr.*—The questions presented by this would be :

1. Did P seek to derive with *ka* an old Vedic form like *āhuva-* (carrying the object sense [535] and) which he probably did not use, by means of his rule (3.1.136) that could produce it (though in the agent sense) ?

2. Why did he not derive the old forms, *āhva-* and *brahm-jya-* (as Kty did) with *ḍa* 'that alone' (—here we neglect Ptj's ingenious **interpretation** of P—) could give them ?

3. Is the Vedic *āhva-*, even as understood by Dārila, at all to be supposed to be derived from *ā* + √*hve-* (+ *ḍa*) ?

4. Did P (– as suggested in fn. 534–) derive the common form *prahva-* " bent " from *pra-* √*hvṛ-* with *ḍa* (of Ptj on 3. 2. 101) ?

5. Did Ptj understand *prahva-* to mean (almost like *āhva-* :) " loud caller " (< *pra-* √*hve-* + *ḍa*), or was it an oversight on his part to derive the more common *prahva-* " bent " from *pra-* √*hve-* (instead of from *pra-* √*hvṛ-*) ?

In the absence of any usage of the times, the only safe answer to the above could be : " *anabhidhānāt* ", — (1) that P did not mean to derive **āhuva-*, **prahuva-* and **brahmajiya-* (showing *ka*) that were not in his usage (though his rule could derive them); and (2) that P did not derive *āhva-*, *prahva-* and *brahma-jya-* (showing *ḍa*) because they were not found in the usage of his own times or in his own region.

The upshot of the above makes us accept :

(1) P's non-use of any of the three forms,

(2) Kty's and Ptj's possible use of the forms, *āhva-* and (the Vedic) *brahma-jya-*, and

(3) probably use of *prahva-* at the time of Ptj alone.

None of the suspected forms, *āhuva-* (except for its doubtful *RV* mention once), **prahuva-* and **brahma-jiya-*, occurs in literature; *brahma-jya-* is not seen in Classical literature.

Obsn 77 : (This may be referred to here for the form, *giri-śa-*.)

<< 16 >> FORMS IN *ANA* (*KHYUN*)

(Sūtra : 3.2.56)

Obsn 133 : (i) P used the forms, *ādhya-ṁ- kárana-*, *subhaga-ṁ-k°*, *sthūla-ṁ-k°*, *palita-ṁ-k°*, *nagna-ṁ-k°* *andha-ṁ-k°* and *priya-ṁ-k°*. The feminine of these with him was probably *ākārānta*.

(ii) Kty used these forms with the same accent; but the feminine with him was *īkārānta*.

(iii) The usage of the Saunāgas agreed with that of Kty.

(iv) The same was Ptj's usage too.

P had enjoined the suffix *khyun* in the sense of an instrument (" with which one does something ") after √*kṛ-* preceded by some specific Upapada-s that although carrying the *cvi*-sense were not *cvyanta* forms. (*ādhya- subhaga-sthūla-palita-nagna = andha-priyeṣu cvyartheṣv acvau kṛñaḥ karaṇe khyun*, 3.2.56.) Thus the Upapada- compounds so noted by him showed at their end the Kṛdanta form *karaṇa-*; it was preceded, first by a nasal infix (*mum-āgama*) brought by the *kh-it* suffix (by 6.3.67), and then by one of the Upapada-s listed.

The forms that were thus established by the Sūtra were : *ādhya-ṁ-karaṇa-* " with which one turns rich, enriching ", *subhaga-ṁ-karaṇa-* " making charming or fortunate ", *sthūla-ṁ-karaṇa-* " making stout or big," *palita-ṁ-kaaaṇa-* " rendering grey ", *nagna-ṁ-karaṇa-* " making naked ", *andha-ṁ-karaṇa-* " making blind ", and *priya-ṁ-karaṇa-* " making agreeable or affectionate. "

Kty has carried a discussion on the propriety of using in the Sūtra the word *acvau* (or laying down the ' *cvi-pratiṣedha*'); and the details of Kty's statements ' as he may have intended, are brought out by Ptj. Now, if the whole argumentation did not bear a merely theoretical value, it carries significance to us as to the linguistic position of the period on the following points :

1. There was the nasal infix between the components of the compounds.

---

[536] GRASSMANN in his *Wörterbuch* (p. 191), however, records the *RV* word as being an accusative plural from the fem. form, *āhū-;* so too *PW* (I.750) on *āhū-;* and both understand it to mean "a call or invocation" (*Anruf*). *VWC* (Vol. I, Part II, p. 746, fn. 1) further suggests to derive the same (*āhū-*) from *ā-√hve-* with the zero-suffix *kvip*.

2. The Kṛdanta form, *karaṇa-*, was accented throughout as *kárana-*, either with *khyun* or with *lyuṭ.*[537]

3. The feminine from this in the usage of Kty and Ptj ended in *karaṇī* (with *khyun* as with *lyuṭ* [538], even though no rule of P established that.

This last point possesses a further importance, firstly, in that the *khyun*-ending fem. forms had been *ī*-ending in the usage of Ptj right since the day of Kty who had specifically enjoined this (4.1.15.6 : *khyuna upasaṁkhyānam*) on the *ṭiḍḍhāṇañ*° (4.1.15) Sūtra that brought about *ī*-ending fem. forms. Secondly, in the period intervening between Kty and Ptj the school of the Saunāgas (mentioned at least seven times directly in *M* besides once indirectly) also continued to give sanction to such forms since they are found to expand Kty's Vt 4.1.15.6 into *nañ-snañ-īkak-khyuns-taruṇa-talunānām upasaṁkhyānam*. This expansion has been referred to by Ptj twice in the name of the Saunāgas (II.105.7f., 238.10f.) and once (on 4.1.15.6) without name (II.209.8). The anonymous reference by Ptj there to the expanded Vt of the Saunāgas, and in the present context (viz. (*īkāreṇa*):*khyuny api sati bhavitavyam* II.105.7), his especially re-affirming mention (*evaṁ hi* " and so also " *saunāgāḥ paṭhanti...* II.105.7f.), perhaps show the well-known nature (and perhaps even wide acceptance) of the usage recorded in the Vt. — Of the seven forms, Ptj has referred in different contexts to *āḍhya-ṁ-karaṇa-* (once at I. 185.5f.), also as *sv-āḍhya-ṁ-karaṇa-* (once at I. 185.6), *āḍhya-ṁ-karaṇī-* (twice at II.209.7, 10), and *subhaga-ṁ-karaṇī-* (twice at II.209.7.10)

Thus, from Kty on, through the times of the Saunāgas, down to the period of Ptj, there can be seen a continuity in the *ī*-ending nature of the Kṛdanta formed with the suffix *khyun*; and this *khyun* is the same *khyun* of 3.2.56, coming after √*kṛ-*, as P has enjoined the suffix only once. That means, the feminine of the Upapada-compounds (containing the specific Upapada-s) ended in *karaṇī-* (and was of course accented on *ka* in it) from the time of Kty onwords. (*—palita-* is used by Kty at 4.1.39.1, and *priya-* at 2.2.35.2, 4.1.1.11)

The fact that P does not provide any rule to show the *ī*-ending feminine forms from them indicates that his usage showed the ā-ending feminine in these cases. — None of the forms in any gender, however, is found attested in early literature, except one, viz. *subhaga-ṁ-karaṇa-*, in *AV* (6.139.1); and here, it is the feminine that is used, which is *subhaga-ṁ-káraṇī-*, an *īkārānta.*[539] But, it is quite possible that the many centuries that intervened between the composition of *AV* and the age of P brought about a shift in the feminine-ending from *ī* to *ā*. Had it been otherwise, i.e. had the forms been *ī*-ending in P's times, he would not have failed to provide a rule establishing them when **seven** specific cases were in question.

---

[537] *'lyuṭ-khyunor aviśeṣāt'* from the Vt 1 here (3.2.56. 1). *lyuṭ* brings the accent by 6.1.193, and *khyun* by 6.1.197.

[538] The same *'aviśeṣa'* mentioned by Kty is understood here too by Ptj.

[539] See M. D. BALASUBRAHMANYAM announcing to examine the validity of the *AV* reading in the light of P's rules, in the summary of his paper, "Subhagaṃkaraṇī in AV (A text-critical-cum-accentual note)", *Summaries of Papers,* A.-I.O.C. XXIV Session, Varanasi (1968), p. 282.

In literature, only *subhaga-ṁ-karaṇa-* (*Rājataraṅgiṇī* 6.78), *subhaga-ṁ-karaṇī-* (*Jānakīharaṇa* 10.24), *palita-ṁ-karaṇa-* (*Vāsav* 297.2), *andha-ṁ-karaṇa-* (*Naiṣadh* 1.87, *Vāsav* 297.2), and *andha-ṁ-karaṇī-* (*Naiṣadh* 8.28, *Padyacū* 8.16) are met with; the rest are unattested.

<< 17 >> FORMS IN -IṢṆU (KHIṢṆUC)

(Sūtra : 3. 2. 57)

Obsn 134 : (i) P used the seven compound-forms, *āḍhya-ṁ-bhaviṣṇu-* etc. We do not know if he used any of their corresponding negative forms, *anāḍhya-ṁ-bhaviṣṇu-* etc., accented on the final syllable.

(ii) A scholiast (later than Kty) perhaps used the forms, *āḍhya-ṁ-bhaviṣṇu-* etc. He might have used the negative forms, *anāḍhya-ṁ-bhaviṣṇu-* etc., accented on the final syllable.

(iii) Ptj's usage was probably alike that of the scholiast referred to.

P (*kartari bhuvaḥ khiṣṇuc-khukañau*, 3.2.57) had enjoined the suffix *khiṣṇuc* (as well as the suffix *khukañ*), in the sense of an agent, after √*bhū-* preceded by the same seven specific Upapada-s as stated in the earlier rule (3. 2. 56), when they carried the sense of a Cvy-anta though not ending in *cvi.*— Thus, the forms derived by the present rule would be : *āḍhya-ṁ-bhaviṣṇu-* "turning rich ", *subhaga-ṁ-bhaviṣṇu-* " becoming charming or fortunate", *sthūla-ṁ-bhaviṣṇu-* "turning big or fatty", *palita-ṁ-bhaviṣṇu-* "turning grey", *nagna-ṁ-bhaviṣṇu-* "becoming naked", *andha-ṁ-bhaviṣṇu-* " turning blind", and *priya-ṁ-bhaviṣṇu-* " becoming dear or agreeable ". (The accent on these would be falling on the final syllable[540] as in *āḍhya-ṁ-bhaviṣṇú-*.) None of the forms, however, is found attested in literature, Vedic or post-Vedic, except *andha-ṁ-bhaviṣṇu-* in the *Anargharāghava* (5. 11) and (as °*tā-*) in *Naiṣadh* (19.36).

The purpose of making the suffix an *ikārādi*, when √*bhū-* would be automatically followed by *i* (or *iḍāgama*) it being an acutely accented root (*iṣṇuca ikārāditvam udāttatvāt kṛtaṁ bhuvaḥ*, II. 106.1), has been stated in a Śloka-vārttika and further discussed by Ptj. The view of the Sl-Vt, as well as the final view of Ptj who concurs with it[541], is the following : As a form ending in *iṣṇuc* and preceded by the negative particle (e.g. *an-āḍhyaṁbhaviṣṇu-*) is to get the accent on the final syllable by a rule of P (*kṛtya=uka=iṣṇuc-cārvādayaś ca*, 6. 2. 160), such a form would be getting the (wanted) accent on the final syllable (as in *anāḍhyaṁbhaviṣṇú-*) if only the suffix in the present rule (3. 2.

---

[540] By *gatikārakopapadāt kṛt* (6.2.139) and *citaḥ* (6.1.163).

[541] So too is felt by Kty (170a). But NBh (l.c.) understands it differently.

57) were stated to be (***kh***) *iṣṇuc* (and not merely ***khsnuc*** or rather ***ksnuc***). Otherwise, if the suffix were stated to be *k*(*h*) ***snuc,*** then such a form (—even with *khiṣṇuc* the form would be the same in other respects—) would not be governed by 6.2.160 but by a different rule (*tatpurase tulyārtha*°, 6.2.2.), and that would bring the (unwanted) accent on the first syllable (as in ***ánādhyaṁbhaviṣṇu-***).

Now, in early literature there is no actual attestation of any of the forms ***anādhyaṁbhaviṣṇu-*** etc. Hence there is no means to test the statement of the Śl-Vt about the accent falling on the final syllable in such forms. Nor is there a record of the time of the Śl-Vt of the existence of forms like ***ādhyaṁbhaviṣṇu-***. Should the whole discussion be then treated as carrying merely a theoretical value, as supposing a linguistic usage (like ***anādhyaṁbhaviṣṇu-*** etc.) to exist at the time of P and thereby saving him from the attacks of criticism ? --Though a definite answer cannot be given to this for want of evidence of the actual usage, we would like to suggest a possibility that this may be reflecting a record of the usage (like ***anādhyaṁbaviṣṇú-*** etc.) that was contemporaneous at least with the author of the Śl-Vt (if not with P or Kty who preceded him). [542] And we can infer from that also currency of the forms, ***ādhyaṁbhaviṣṇu-*** etc., at that time. The same may be said of Ptj.

None of the negative-type forms, ***anādhyaṁbhaviṣṇu-*** etc., with or without any accent, is attested in literature, Vedic or post-Vedic.

---

[542] See fn. 195 : p. 232 — "There is every reason to believe that those works* were composed after the *Vârttikas*" (*I.e. "the verses which have been explained in the Mahâbhâshya.")

<18>> FORMS IN ZERO$_1$ (*KVIN*)

(Sūtra-s : 3.2.59,60)

Obsn 135: (i) P used the form, *dádhṛṣ-*.

(ii) Kty perhaps noted the Vedic occurrence of the form as *dadhṛ́ṣ-*. Probably his note referred to the usage of his own time.

(iii) Ptj's usage was the same as that of Kty.

P has enumerated *dadhṛṣ-* ''bold, daring[543] among some extraordinary forms showing the zero-suffix *kvin* (*ṛtvig-dadhṛk-*[544]*-srag-dig-uṣṇig-añcu-yuji-kruñcāṁ ca,* 3.2.59). This *dadhṛṣ-* is formed with *kvin* from (— what is not normal —) the reduplicated base of √*dhṛṣ-* ''to be bold, daring or courageous." Now, the suffix here being *n-it* brings the accent on the first syllable (by 6.1.197).

The form, *dadhṛ́ṣ-*, occurs thrice in *RV* (5. 66. 3, 8. 82. 2, 10. 16. 7), always accented on the final syllable. But P, who does not qualify the Sūtra with a word like '*chandasi*' and does not provide a rule for the final accent here, does not seem to take the trouble of explaining it here; he has, therefore, evidently recorded by this Sūtra the form *dádhṛṣ-* (with initial accent) from the usage of his own times when it was accented on the first syllable (as *dádhṛṣ-*).

Kty perhaps noted the Vedic occurrence of the form with the final accent, and interpreted P to be recording that as an additional extra-ordinary factor in the form besides the other factor of reduplication in the root. (3. 2. 59. 1: *dhṛṣer dvirvacanam antodāttatvaṁ ca*, introduced by Ptj following *dadhṛg iti kiṁ nipātyate* ? II. 106. 21.)[545] However, as he has not accompanied his note with '*chandasi*' as he does when he wants to point out the Vedic usage, it can be said that he too noted the use of the form from his own usage when the accent was again shown on the final syllable : it was perhaps a coincidence that the position of the accent on the form after this shift was the same as in its Vedic occurrence.

---

[543] On its occurrence in *RV* Sāyaṇa renders '*dadhṛk*' twice with *dhṛṣṭaḥ pragalbhaḥ* (8.82.2, 10.16.7) and once with *dharṣakau* (5.66.3). *PW* first (3.505) notes *dadhṛk* as an adverb, and next (5.1485)) as an adjective.

[544] The *ku-tva* is by the rule, *kvin-pratyayasya kuḥ* (8.2.62).

[545] One school would like to understand, in all such cases, P's "Nipātana" itself to be implying inclusion of **each and every** kind of peculiarity, including the accent, in the form under question. This supposition draws strength from places like this of Ptj's introducing the peculiarities in *dadhṛṣ-* (II.106.21) where he shows himself siding with the omnipotence of a Nipātana. (See, further, cases like **7.** arya-, **24.** *kupya-*, **25.** *kṛṣṭa-pacya-*, **36,** *kuṇḍa-pāyya-*, **38.** *agnicityā-* and **133.** *subhaga-ṁ-karaṇī.*) For a discussion on evidence from the Tradition and views by modern scholars, see S. D. LADDU, "The Laukika, Vaidika and Yājñika Accentuation with the Muni-traya of Sanskrit Grammar," *Indian Antiquary,* Third Series (*Prof. R. N. Dandekar Felicitation Volume,* 1969) 3.93-111.

Ptj's silence, or rather his not objecting to Kty's observation, is indicative of continuation of the usage of Kty in his times as well.

The form is not attested in early literature other than *RV*.

Obsn 136: (i) P, Kty and Ptj, all, used the forms, *sa-dṛś-*, *tā-dṛś-* etc.

(ii) P does not seem to have had *anyā-dṛś-* in his usage.

(iii) Kty and Ptj had it in their usage.

P had enjoined the suffixes ***kvin*** and ***kañ*** after √*dṛś-* when it did not mean "to see" but probably "to appear or resemble" and when it was preceded by Upapada-s 'like *tyad-*'. (*tyadādiṣu dṛśo' nālocane kañ ca*, 3.2.60.) These pronominal Upapada-s form a sub-section of the *sarvādi-gaṇa* mentioned at 1.1.27. So, by 3.2.60 forms like *tyādṛś-*, *tādṛś-* "resembling that", *yā-dṛś-*[546] "resembling what" etc. could be established with the zero-suffix ***kvin***, and *tyā-dṛśa-*, *tā-dṛsa-* "resembling that", *yā-dṛśa-*[546] "resembling what" etc. with the suffix *kañ*.

Kty saw in his usage the forms, *sadṛś-*, *°śa-* "looking similar" and ***anyādṛś-***, *°śa-*[546] "resembling another", which also showed the same type of formation as stated in the rule of P, with the Upapada-s *samāna-* and ***anya-*** respectively. He says that these two Upapada-s should also be included in the sphere of P's rule applicable to the *tyadādi* forms. (3. 2. 60. 1: ***dṛśeḥ samāna=anyayoś ca=upasaṁkhyānam.***)[547] That indicates that in Kty's times

---

[646] The final *ad* or *a* in these cases is changed to *ā* by the rule, *ā sarvanāmnaḥ* (6.3.91).

[547] Immediately in the next Vt, however, Kty points out (3.2.60.2 : *kṛdarthānupapattis tu*) that, in the case of such forms (probably in general), the Kṛdanta sense (of being the agent of an action by *kartari kṛt* 3.4.67) does not fit in literally; as e.g. *tā-dṛś-* does not mean "who sees him" etc. but "who resembles him." (See Kaiy 171a : *yaḥ kṛto 'rthaḥ sa tādṛśādiśabda-vācyo na bhavati. tādṛśādayo hi sadṛśa-lakṣaṇam artham ācakṣate, na tu darśanakriyāyāḥ kartāram ity arthaḥ.* — Hence, according to him (3.2.60.3 : *ivārthe tu taddhitaḥ*), such forms may be treated as Taddhita formations (with the help of some imaginary Taddhita suffixes) in the sense of "resembling". (See NBh 171b.)

This, together with the comments from *KV* etc., sounds reasonable. (See *KV* 179 : *tādṛgādayo hi rūḍhiśabdaprakārāḥ; naivātra darśanakriyā vidyate.* Also *Ny* 585 : *rūḍhiśabdeṣu nāvayavārthena bhavitavyam. kiṁ tarhi? samudāyārthena.*) A counter-example in the literal sense of "seeing him" is provided by *KV* (l.c.) as *tad-darśa-* which, however, is not attested in literature.

But Ptj makes a hard attempt to show that P was correct in treating these as Kṛdanta forms. He wants us to understand them as denoting the reflexive action, as e.g. *tādṛś-* meaning "looking at oneself as being him (like whom people understand him)". (*tam iva=imaṁ paśyanti janāḥ; so 'yaṁ, sa iva dṛśyamānas, tam iva=ātmānaṁ paśyati : tādṛk.* II.107.13f.) This appears to be a much roundabout and ingenious way of explanation. Kty's afterthought and *KV* way of looking at the forms as conventional terms or Rūḍhiśabda-s seems to be the rational way of explanation in such cases.

samāna- and *anya-* were not found in the *tyadādi* group, and he was, therefore, required to note them specially to make them receive this one operation due to the *tyadādi* forms (3.2.60) that they would not have otherwise received. —It is true that in the *tyadādi* sub-section of *sarvādi-gaṇa* which we find at present, the order of *anya-* is earlier than that of *tyad-*; and *samāna-* is not found even in the larger *sarvādi-gaṇa*.

But, the form *sa-dṛśa-* is found used by P in two of his rules (2.1.31, 6.2.11). Not only that; he is also found to **derive** by his rule, *dṛg-dṛśa-vatuṣu* (6.3.89) (*samānasya* 84 *saḥ* 78), the two forms, *sa-dṛś-* (showing *kvin*) and *sa-dṛśa-* (showing *kañ*). About the other forms, *anyā-dṛś-* (with *kvin*) and *anyā- dṛśa-* (with *kañ*), however, it cannot be stated that P knew them, first as *anya-* is not found included in the *tyadādi-* group, and secondly as the forms are not also found used by P in any of his rules.—As for *GP*, we do find in it *sadṛś-* (*śaratprabhṛti* G (aṇa)[549] at 5.4.107), *sadṛśa-* (*kṛśāśvādi* G[550] at 4.2.80 and *cārvādi* G at 6.2.160), *samāna-* (*sapatnyādi* G at 4.1.35), and *anya-* (*utkarādi* G at 4.2.90 and *sarvādi* G at 1.1.27).

Thus, it can be said that, in the case of *sa-dṛś-* and *sa-dṛśa-*, Kty's Vt neither shows (addition of) a new usage developed at his time nor supplies a derivation of what was left underived by P. He may be right in indicating a new development of the forms, *anyā-dṛs-* and *anyā-dṛśa-*. This is corroborated by the fact that both *sa-dṛś-* and *sa-dṛśa-* occur in *TS* (2.2.8.5, 7.3.17.1 respectively) and in the other Vedic texts. Further, *anyā-dṛś-* is found to occur in *VS* (17.81) that was probably not utilised by P, and *anyā-dṛśa-* occurs in *ChUp* (4.14.2) which was probably later than P.

The other form, *tā-dṛś-*, mentioned by Ptj (see fn. 547), occurs in the Veda — frequently in *ŚBr* — and *Manu*; and *tā-dṛśa-* occurs in *Manu*.

---

[548] In the reconstructions of BIRWE, *samāna-* is found in the *sapatnyādi-gaṇa* (p. 51) but not *anya-* in the *utkarādi-gaṇa* (p. 59).

[549] Not found in its reconstruction by BIRWE (p. 419).

[550] Found in its reconstruction by BIRWE (p. 179).

<< 19 >> FORMS IN A_{11} (*KAÑ*)

(Sūtra : 3. 2. 60)

Obsn 137 : (i) P, Kty and Ptj, all, used the forms, *sa–dṛśa–*, *tā–dṛśa–* etc.

(ii) P does not seem to have had *anyā– dṛśa–* in his usage.

(iii) Kty and Ptj had it in their usage.

(The discussion here is the same as on Obsn 136, as the Sūtra 3. 2. 60 of P, the Vt–s of Kty on them and Ptj's observations, thereon apply equally to forms ending in the suffix *kvin* and to those ending in the suffix *kañ.*)

<< 20 >> FORMS IN ZERO$_2$ (*KVIP*)

(Sūtra-s: 3.2.61,76,77)

Obsn 138: (i) Probably P's usage showed Subantopapada-s compounded with Kṛdanta-s from some specific roots followed by the suffix *kvip*..

(ii) Kty's usage showed such compound-forms.

(iii) Probably Ptj's usage too contained such forms.

P had enjoined the zero-suffix *kvip* after some specific roots either when they were or were not preceded by an Upasarga. (*sat-sū-dviṣa-druha-duha-yuja-vida-bhida-cchida-ji-nī-rājām upasarge ' pi kvip*, 3.2.61.) Kty added a Vt on this Sūtra saying that the roots may be preceded by any Subantopapada, probably thinking that the Anuvṛtti of '*karmaṇi*' from the *karmaṇy aṇ* (3.2.1) rule might be supspected by a student here, looking to the transitive nature of many of the roots listed in the rule.[551] (3.2.61.6: *sadādiṣu sub-grahaṇam*).

By supposing the presence of '*supi*' here from the *supi sthaḥ* (3.2.4) rule, as some do (and which might also be suggested in '*grahaṇam*' by Kty), it can be said that at the time of Kty there were current in the usage forms that showed Subantopapada-s to the listed roots (3.2.61) that were followed by the zero-suffix *kvip;* and that points to the same situation holding at the time of P also.

Ptj has accepted the point of Kty about having the Subantopapada forms. He illustrates it by citing the forms, *vedi-ṣad-* " sitting on the sacrificial altar " and *duroṇa-sad-* " sitting inside the house ", also supplying the full usages for them as : *hotā vediṣat; atithir duroṇasat* (II. 107.19). This is, however, found to be a quotation from *RV* as *hótā vediṣád átithir duroṇsát* (4.40.5). *vedi-ṣad-* is also seen at *VS* 2.29 and *TBr* 1.2.1.23.

Although Ptj has not supplied any example from the secular usage, the fact that he has not thought of restricting the usage to the Veda can be said to indicate that the usage was current in his time as well. Why he did not cite the latter one may not necessarily be because it was not current then; the omission of such common usage was probably accidental and not conscious. Continuity of the usage can, therefore, be understood during the period of the Munitraya.

---

[551] Cf. Kaiy (172a) : *sadādīnāṁ keṣāṁcit sakarmakatvāt karmaivopapadaṁ prāpnoti=iti matvā=āha.*

[552] See NBh (l.c.) : *vastutaḥ subgrahaṇam evātrānuvartate, karmaṇi=iti nivṛttam;* also at 171b.

The particular forms from the illustrative quotation of Ptj are not attested in literature later though *vedi-* is found with P at 5.4.84; and they cannot be accepted as being current in the usages of the Munitraya.

Obsn 139: (i) It cannot be said if either P or Kty had in their usage the form *śaṁ-sthā-* (that expressed a name).

(ii) Ptj had it in his usage (probably as a name).

P probably saw a number of forms in his usage that were compounds formed out of any Upapada and a Kṛdanta from √*sthā-* with *kvip* or *ka*. (See Obsn **85**.) So he laid down the rule, *sthaḥ ka ca* (3. 2. 77).

Although *kvip* was already enjoined by (the Tācchīlyādi rule) *anyebhyo 'pi dṛśyate* (3. 2. 178) according to Ptj[553], it was, according to him, feared to be ruled out by *ac* enjoined in *śami dhātoḥ saṁjñāyām* (3.2.14) that formed names out of the Upapada *śam-* and any root followed by *ac*. (Cp. *uktam etac .... ṭa-pratiṣedhārtham iti; sa yathaiva = ac ṭaṁ bādhata, evaṁ ka-kvipāv api bādheta.* II. 109. 2-3) It is, therefore, for the purpose of definitely getting the suffix *kvip* that it was re-enjoined by P in the present rule. The form, thus obtained, was *śaṁ-sthā-* "being in prosperity, happy" as noticed by Ptj[554]. The argument of Ptj strongly indicates that it was a form that expresed a name (Saṁjñā).

For want of literary evidence, we cannot be sure that the form was current in the times of P or Kty.

The form is not attested in literature.

---

[553] Or, by *kvip ca* (3.2.76) according to NBh (174a).

[554] See fn. 348 on Obsn **85**.

<< 21 >> FORMS IN ZERO$_4$ (*VIṬ*)

(Sūtra-s : 3. 2. 67–69)

Obsn 140 : Probably all the three, P Kty and Ptj, had in their usage even both the forms, *āmād-* and *kravyād-*; they did not use the form *kravyāda-*.

P has enjoined the zero-suffix *viṭ* after √*ad-* when preceded by an Upapada other than *anna-* (*ado 'nanne*, 3.2.68). With *anna-* as the Upapada, the form would result in *annāda-* (i. e. *anna* =*āda-*) as √*ad-* would then be taking the general *karmopapada* suffix *aṇ* (by *karmaṇy aṇ* 3.2.1). With an Upapada other than *anna-*, as e. g. *āma-* "a raw stuff (of food)" (-not found with P or Kty-), we would get the form, *āmād-* (i. e. *āma=ad-*) " eating raw food." This *āmād-* must have occurred in the seculur language at the time of Ptj for it is mentioned by him as a wanted form (II. 108. 4.)[555] As the form is found in *RV, AV, VS* and also in *ŚBr* (1. 2. 1. 4.), it may be taken that it, and probably similar other forms, occurred in the usages of P and Kty as well. Later, however, *āmād-* is not found attested in the classical literature.

In the very next Sūtra, P has enjoined the same suffix after the same root when the latter was preceded by *kravya-* " flesh " as the Upapada (*kravye ca*, 3.2.69). Now it is obvious that the formation of *kravyād-* " consuming flesh ", derived by this Sūtra, falls rightfully within the scope of the previous Sūtra (3.2.68) and could be derived by the same rules. Why then this redundant framing of the present Sūtra (3.2.69) ?

The answer given by Kty (on behalf of P)[556] points to the situation that Kty did not have in usage the form *kravyāda-*, and also that he had in usage the form *kravyād-*. Not only that; his argument. that appears to be in keeping with the technique of P and hence as quite acceptable,[557] reflects prevalence of the same usage in the time of P also. Ptj too seems to concur with the view and hence to admit the usage stated by Kty.

---

[555] It is difficult to agree with THIEME (*P & V* 36) who feels it "a matter of judgment" to recognize such forms (that are attested in the Veda) as classical ones.

[556] It is this : With *kravya-* as the Karmopapada to √*ad-* it would be possible by the rule *karmaṇy aṇ* (3.2.1) to derive the unwanted form *kravyāda-* (i.e. *kravya=āda-*), and the rule *ado 'nanne* (3.2.68), that would derive the wanted form *kravyād-* (i.e. *kravya=ad-*), would not be able to supersede the *karmaṇy aṇ* rule (and the form *karvyāda-* got by it); for, the *vā'sarūpa-paribhāṣā* would be establishing both the forms alternatively. So, in order to prohibit the operation of that Paribhāṣā (and thus to prohibit the operation of the *karmaṇy aṇ* rule getting *karvyāda-*), a specific iteration of the Upapada *kravya-* was made by means of the *kravye ca* (3.2.69) rule. (3.2.69.1 : *ado'nanne kravye-grahaṇam vāsarūpa-nivṛttyartham.*)

The form *kravyād-* is attested in *VS* (1.17), *AV* (12.2.4, as *akr*° at 12.2.3), *ŚŚSū* (4.19.10), *MBhr* (1.58.28, 13.104.27) and *Manu* (5.131, 11.199, 12.58). As for *kravyāda-*, it is of frequent occurrence in the Epics besides in *Manu*; and one is at a loss to find Kty not accepting the form in his usage or at least not granting his sanction to it as a 'correct' form.

---

[557] THIEME (l.c., 34-37), however, proposes a different interpretation of *kravye ca* (3.2.69), understands "the flow of Vedisms" to be present in that rule, and suspects here "even the great Kātyāyana nodding".

<< 22 >> FORMS IN -*IN*$_1$ (*ṆINI*)

(Sūtra-s : 3. 2. 78-83, 3. 1. 134, 3. 2. 51, 3. 3. 170).

Obsn 141: (i) We do not know if P or Kty used habit-denoting Kṛdanta forms showing an Upasarga preceding the root, and specifically those noted by Ptj.

(ii) Ptj's usage showed the forms, *pratyāsāriṇī-* and *udāsāriṇī-*, that were of such a nature, and probably many more such forms.

P had laid down the suffix *ṇini* after roots preceded by case-inflected Upapada-s not denoting a genus (or a caste ?) and when the whole compound denoted a habit of the doer (*supy a-jātau ṇinis tācchīlye*, 3. 2. 78).

A case-inflected Upapada is referred to in the Sūtra by the word ' *supi* '. But the presence of ' *supi* ' in this Sūtra could have been drawn by Anuvṛtti from an earlier rule wherein it occurs, viz. *supi sthaḥ* (3. 2. 4). That induces Ptj to understand ' *supi* ' in the present rule to cover the Upasarga-s as well. [558]

This is an interpretation thought out by Ptj on the rule of P, an interpretation that is not purely theoretical in nature but having a basis in the usage of his time that he has supplied. Thus, the examples given by him are : *pratyāsāriṇī-* " following in the reverse direction " and *udāsāriṇī-* " following upwards " (*pratyāsāriṇyaḥ udāsāriṇyaḥ* II. 109. 6). Why he has used the feminine plural in the both the examples is not clear in the absence of a mention of the nouns qualified by them. Did they refer to '*nadyaḥ*' " rivers "?—Any way, it can be seen from the fact of his producing two examples that there was probably a large number in his usage of such forms showing an Upasarga.

As for the usages of P and Kty we have no means to ascertain them; we can say only this much that there was a bothway possibility depending upon whether Ptj's interpretation is accepted as valid for P and / or Kty.

The two particular forms are not attested in literature; but BhD produces a number of instances from classical literature illustrating the type of usage (i.e. showing an Upasarga) (*SK* 2988, *ŚabK* II. 455).

---

[558] The question that arises here is this : why is this second, and perhaps redundant, mention of the same word in the Sūtra, that ordinarily goes against the technique of P ? — The answer given by Ptj is this : The former *'supi'* from 3.2.4 excluded the Upasarga-s (— which are also Subanta-s —) by the Anuvṛtti of *'anupasarge'* in that rule from the previous rule (*āto 'nupasarge kaḥ*, 3.2.3). However, *'supi'* in the present rule (3.2.78) stands for **any** Subanta (*'sub-mātre'* II.109.6), covering even the Upasarga-s.

Obsn 142 : A. (i) P, Kty, and Ptj used the compound-form *sādhu-kārin-*.

(ii) Ptj in addition used the form *sādhu-dāyin-*.

(iii) Probably Kty and Ptj had in their usages also other forms denoting a skilful doer of an action.

B. (i) To P the *in*-ending Upapada-compounds denoted a habitual doer.

(ii) To Kty and Ptj they denoted a well-doer of the same act.

On P's rule enjoining *ṇini* after roots preceded by a non-genus-denoting Upapada in a resulting compound showing the habit of the doer (*supy a-jātau ṇinis tācchīlye,* 3.2.78), Kty notes that the suffix can be used even when the resultant form denoted a *sādhu-kārin-* " one doing an action well or skilfully " (as against a habitual doer [559]). (3.2.78.1 : *ṇin-vidhau sādhukāriṇy upasaṁkhyānam.*)

Incidentally, the form *sādhu-kārin-* also shows the same suffix *ṇini* and may be derived by the present rule of P. Kty has used this form also once again (3.1.149.1 : *pru-sṛ-lvaḥ sādhukāriṇi vunvidhānam*). P too is found to be using it once (3.2.134 : *ā kves tacchīla-taddharma-tatsādhukāriṣu*). [560] — That both of them understood and expressed a clear distinction between (the types of forms with) (1) Tācchīlya (or Samabhihāra) " habitually (or repeatedly) doing an act " and (2) Sādhukāritā 'skilfully doing an act " (or between Tacchīla- and Tatsādhukārin-) has been shown earlier.[561]

The examples Ptj has given in illustration of the Vt are rather misleading. The first example is *sādhu-kārin-* " acting well or rightly (occasionally)" (*sādhukārī* II. 109. 8), which gives the impression that Kty's Vt wished to intimate the form *sādhū-kārin-* (though not expressed by '*sādhukāriṇaḥ*' in the Vt) (rather than the sense of being an excellent doer of an action). But Ptj goes on to give the second and the final example as *sādhu-dāyin-* " one who gives well or liberally (occasionally)" (*sādhudāyī* l. c.). Here again the sameness of the Upapada '*sādhu-*' in the two examples gives the idea that only such Upapada-compounds as contain '*sādhu-*' as the Upapada were intended. Ptj probably means to suggest neither of these two things as being intended by the Vt. (Borrowing an idiom from Kty at 3.1.125.1,2, it may be said that *sādhu-* here is the *'Dyotya'*, not the *'Upapada'*.) It can, therefore, only be said that his examples could have been more clear and un-ambiguous. Is the absence of unambiguous examples due to the lack or rarity of such forms in his usage ?

---

[559] Cp. *Ny* (597), *atācchīlyārtha ārambhaḥ;* and Kaiy (174a) and *PdM* (597) *atācchīlyārtham idam.*

[560] The form is thus *'jñāpaka-siddha'* according to *TattvaB* (p. 499).

[561] See discussion under Obsn **97.** Compare also his much similar modification there (*'sādhukāriṇi'* for P's *'samabhihāre'*) at 3.1.149.1.

Anyway, the form *sādhu-kārin-* is found to be in continuous usage from P to Ptj. It can be suspected that there were more forms in the sense of a skilful doer in the usages of Kty and Ptj, but we have no clear evidence on that especially of the time of Ptj.

sādhu-kārin- is probably first attested in *ŚBr* (14. 7. 2. 6); it is also found in *MBhr* (4. 25. 8). *sādhu-dāyin-* is not attested.

Obsn 143 : (i) P knew the form *brahmavādin-*, and probably even established it in the habit-sense.

(ii) Kty and Ptj had it in their usage probably in the well-doing sense.

On P's rule enjoining *ṇini* in forms denoting a habitual doer of an action (3. 2. 78), Kty has further noted (3. 2. 78. 2 : *brahmaṇi vadaḥ*) one form (—again probably as an exception to the habitual-doer sense[562] —), *brahma-vādin-* " one discoursing on the Sacred Text (the Veda) or on the Supreme Reality ". —The form is illustrated by Ptj with a connected usage (but without indication of the accent) as *brahma-vādino vadanti* (II. 109. 10), which is seen at *AV* (11.3.26, 15.1.8), *TS* (2. 5. 4. 1, 3. 1. 2. 2, 5. 5. 3. 2) and as the introductory line of the *Śvetāśvataropaniṣad* (1. 1).[562a] No instance from the secular usage is given.

The form is well attested in the Veda and in the Epics and *Manu.* The fact that P did not appear to have derived it was probably due to his having been not understood properly. P probably intended to establish it by his general rule (3. 2. 78) obtaining forms in the habit-sense; while Kty's usage probably showed the form in the well-doing sense (as " one who discoursed well on the Veda "), by the Anuvṛtti of the expression *sādhukāriṇi* from his provious Vt (3. 2. 78. 1). (See fn 561.) The same situation probably continued at the time of Ptj.

Obsn 144 : (i) It cannot be said definitely that either P or Kty used any of the forms, *sthāyin-*, *āsthāyin-*, *sthaṇḍila-sthāyin-* and *sthaṇḍila-śāyin-*, to denote a person observing a vow; more possibly they used the last one.

(ii) Ptj used either of the forms, more possibly the last one, to denote a person observing a vow.

P had enjoined the suffix *ṇini* after a root preceded by a Subantopapada, when the whole compound denoted an agent strictly observing a kind of vow (*vrate* 3. 2. 80). — To explain the compound *aśrāddhabhojin-*, also denoting a performer or a vow and also showing *ṇini* at the end, Ptj takes the example of *sthāyin-* (apparently formed regularly according to him); for *sthāyin-* also shows the same suffix and denotes one practising a vow either of "remaining (at the same place, with or without movement)"[563] or of "standing (as opposed to sitting)."[564] Thus, he writes : *sthāyī yadā na tiṣṭhati tadāsya vratalopo bhavati* (II. 109. 13f.).

---

[562] See *Ny* (597) : *ayam apy atācchīlyārtha ārambhaḥ, jātyartho vā;* and Kaiy (174a).

[562a] For further references, see V. P. LIMAYE, *CSM*, p. 203f.

It can be asked how the present rule meant to derive compound-forms can establish a simple form like *sthāyin-*.[565] That is answered by NBh by taking recourse to the diversity mentioned in the next rule, *bahulam ābhīkṣṇye* (3. 2, 81).[566] But it can be pointed out that the rule referred to by NBh for deriving *sthāyin-* would give the form the sense of "one repeatedly or constantly (*ābhīkṣṇye*) remaining (or 'standing') ", and **not** that of an observer of a vow. As this latter sense referring to a vow has been mentioned in clear terms by Ptj in the example *sthāyin-*, the form cannot be said to be derivable by the next rule but only by the present rule. Hence, Ptj's example must have been some Upapada-compound (probably) ending in *sthāyin-*. Or, NBh may be understood to be referring only to the diversity part but not to the repetition part of the next rule.

NBh refers in this connection to two other readings for '*sthāyī*' : the one merely showing a different word-division (after *tad yathā*), viz. *āsthāyī*, and the other, *sthaṇḍila-sthāyī* (getting also '*sthaṇḍile*' after '*yadā*' II. 109. 13f.). The first reading is open to the same criticism as that on '*sthāyī* .' The second one where the stem means "remaining (or less likely here : 'standing') on the bare (sacrificial) ground ", is supported by the MSS G D g B, according to the critical apparatus supplied by KIELHORN. Both these readings are not accepted by Kty or NBh.[567]

In *M* neither *sthāyin-* nor *sthaṇḍila-sthāyin-* is mentioned again elsewhere; but once *sthaṇḍila-śāyin-* "one who sleeps on the (bare) sacrificial ground" (as well as its feminine, °*yinī-*) is mentioned (II. 192. 24 on 4.1.1.5), perhaps on the basis of P (4. 2. 15 : *sthaṇḍilāc chayitari vrate*) who might appear to be having it in his usage in the very sense of the vow (though deriving there the form *sthāṇḍila* with *aṇ* from 4. 1. 83). *sthāyin-* is, however, found mentioned in the *grahyādi-gaṇa* referred to at 3. 1. 134 (not denoting the vow idea).

---

[563] According to Kaiy; cf. *sthāyī=ityatra tu sthānaviparīta-gamanācaraṇe yukto vratalopaḥ* (174b).

[564] According to 'Pare' mentioned by NBh (l.c.); see : *utthita evādya bhaviṣyāmi, na tūpavekṣyāmy=ityevaṁsaṁkalparūpaṁ vratam etat; 'tiṣṭhan mūtrayate' ityādivad utthāne sthā-dhātur atra=iti pare.*

[565] See NBh (l.c.) : *nanv atra kathaṁ ṇiniḥ, supa upapadasyābhāvāt* ?

[566] NBh (l.c.) *uttara-sūtrād bahula-grahaṇam apakṛṣya kevalād api vidhānena=akṣateḥ.*

[567] See NBh (l.c.) : *tad ubhayam api bhāṣya-kaiyaṭa-viruddham.*

Hence it might be understood either that the uncompounded *sthāyin-* was introduced newly in usage of Ptj, or that *sthaṇḍila-śāyin-* was in continuous from P up to Ptj.

In literature, *sthāyin-* generally occurs at the end of a compound and not carrying either the sense of a vow or that of repeated action. (Cf. *giri-sthāyin-* and *megha-sthāyin-* in *Nir* 1.20, and *saṁvatsara-sthāyin-* in *MBhr* 6. 3. 25.) But rarely it also occurs as an independent form, as *sthāyīny*[568] *etāni* (*svarāṇi*) *yathā bṛhadrathantare* (*ĀŚSū* 8. 5. 16 or 2. 2. 5. 16) and in ...... *yaḥ sthāyī kalpānte parivartate / sa śete bhagavān apsu* (*MBhr* 12. 271. 62). At both these places, again, neither of the two senses is apparent. — *sthaṇḍila-sthāyin-* is not attested; but *sthaṇḍila-śāyin-* is used twice in *Rām* (3. 5. 4, 5. 18. 25) to refer to one practising a vow, as in *vratī sthaṇḍilaśāyī ca śaṅke jīvati vā na vā /* (5. 18. 25). *āsthāyin-* is not attested in literature.

Obsn 145 : Probably none of P, Kty and Ptj used *bhojin-* as an independent form.

Ptj had in his usage the form, *aśrāddhabhojin-*[569] "one who (as a vow) does not eat food during the performance of a Śrāddha ceremony." The compound shows the suffix *ṇini* which is enjoined by P at the end of Upapada-compounds, denoting one practising a vow (*vrate* 3. 2. 80). The compound, however, is an *asamartha-samāsa* and is to be explained as *na bhojī śrāddhasya* (II.109.16f.).

But how was this '*bhojin-*' "one who eats food" formed? Another similar form, *sthāyin-*, used shortly earlier and on the same Sūtra by Ptj, was derived by NBh by taking recourse to the next rule of P, *bahulam ābhīkṣṇye* (3. 2. 81). Here, however, NBh is not favourable for deriving *bhojin-* by the same rule (3. 2. 81).

In not taking *bhojin-* as an '*iṣṭa*' form NBh follows Kaiy who says that it was used by Ptj just to explain the grammatical formation although it is never used independently[572]. Ptj also is not found to be using the form again in M.

In literature too *bhojin-* is found, almost without exception, at the end of a compound. (Cf. *Manu* 4. 212, *MBhr* etc.)

Thus it appears that the form was generally not used independently,

---

[568] Nārāyaṇa in his *Vṛtti* renders this as *nityāni*.

[569] See Obsn **147**.

[570] Whose text here has probably undergone some corruption as is evident from the disagreement among the MSS.; see Obsn **144**.

[571] See NBh (175a) *bahula-grahaṇaṁ tu 'kvacid' iṣṭa-siddhaye.*

[572] Cp. *na hi kevalasya bhojī-śabdasya prayogaḥ* (175a).

Obsn 146: Probably none of P, Kty and Ptj used the form, *śrāddha-bhojin-*.

A discussion was carried by Ptj as to how the form *aśrāddha-bhojin-* from the usage should be dissolved. One suggestion was to understand *aśrāddha-bhojī* as *na śrāddhabhojī* (II. 109.15). Apart from the unwanted accent that this explanation brought on the form as *áśrā⁰*, it can be asked whether *śrāddha-bhojin-* itself was a possible form. The meaning that it would convey is "one who (as a vow) eats food during the Śrāddha ceremony", as the suffix *ṇini* is enjoined by P to derive forms referring to an agent practising a vow (3.2.80). But no such vow is heard of, and hence the form itself, though grammatically possible, is not a happy (*sādhu*) or desirable (*iṣṭa*) formation (or is an *anabhidhāna*). It was used only by way of a grammatical expansion.[573]

It, therefore, appears that the form was not in the usage at any time, although Ptj does not expressly mention its rejection.

The form is not attested in literature.

---

[573] See Kaiy (174b) : *samāsārthaṁ prakriyā-vākyam idam, na tu laukikam. na hi kevalaḥ śrāddhabhoji-śabdo vratavişaya upapadyate.* For, says NBh (l.c.), *na hi tādṛśavrata-saṁbhavaḥ.*

B-4. EXTRAORDINARY CASES OF TṚJĀDI-ENDING FORMS

Obsn 147: (i) Probably P and Kty did not have in their usage the form, *nagara-ghāta-*, referring to a non-human agent.

(ii) The form was developed in the usage of Ptj.

P derived Upapada-compounds from √*han-* with *ṭak* when a non-human agent was to be denoted (*amanuṣya-kartṛke ca*, 3.2.53). (This made the compound end in the Kṛdanta *ghna-*[474] .)

Ptj's usage showed the phrase, *nagara-ghāto hasti* (II. 104.14, 16) " a town-destroying elephant ". As the idea fitted in the condition laid down in the rule of P, we ought to have had the form, **nagara-ghna-*, showing the suffix *ṭak* according to it, instead of the form, *nagara-ghāta-*, showing *aṇ*. —As the formation clearly went against the rule of P[575], and as the form was required to be derived, Ptj (II. 104.16f.) took help from the license-rule of P (*kṛtya-lyuṭo bahulam*, 3.3.113), or **rather from** the revised license-rule that was suggested there by himself (*kṛto bahulam*, II. 155.12).

Leaving aside the interpretative aspect of Ptj's comment, the historical fact of the times becomes here apparent. The usage showing the un-Pāṇinian *nagara-ghāta-* was obviously developed later; probably later not only than P but later even than Kty, as the latter has not taken note of it as Ptj was required to do.[576]

Neither *nagara-ghāta-* nor **nagara-ghna-* is found attested in early literature.

Obsn 148 · (i) Probably neither P nor Kty used the form, *aśrāddhabhojin-*.

(ii) Ptj's usage showed the form, *aśrāddhabhojin-*.

In the usags of P, an Upapada-compound denoting an agent engaged in the performance of a vow showed the suffix *ṇini* at the end of its Kṛdanta member (*vrate*, 3. 2. 80). Ptj's usage showed *aśrāddhabhojin-* as one such

---

[574] See fn. 461 on Obsn **115**.

[575] See further Obsn **116**.

[576] A similar other form, *amitraghāta-*, probably qualifying a man, is found noted by Ptj (II.112.15). It is, however, not attested in literature, the solitary record by *pw* (1.97) as from *MBhr* (3.70) being not traced.

form, meaning "one who (as a vow) does not take food during the performance of a Śrāddha ceremony." But how was this three-member form to be dissolved ?

It could not be dissolved as '*yo śrāddhaṁ bhuṅkte so* '*śrāddhabhojī*' (II.. 109. 12) "one who (as a vow) eats food not during the performance of a Śrāddha ceremony". For, when one does not eat even such food [577] that would mean break of a vow on one's part. But such a strange kind of vow is not possible. Hence the form cannot be explained like that.

Next, the alternative of explaining it as '*na śrāddhabhojī aśrāddhabhojī*' (II. 109. 15) has also to be rejected; for, apart from the impossible kind of vow mentioned by it in the form ***śrāddha-bhojin-***, [578] it brings the unwanted accent as *áśrāddhabhojin-* [579]. The accent noticed in the form by Ptj was as *aśrāddhabhojín-*.

Lastly, therefore, it was decided to explain it as '*na bhojī śrāddhasya*' (II. 109. 16). This, however, made it an incoherent or syntactically ill-connected compound (*asamartha-samāsa*) [581]; for, the negative particle *a* was related not with '*śrāddha-*' but with √*bhuj-*.

Even then this last type of dissolution of the particular compound was accepted by Ptj as he was required to sanction a few such cases that had firmly set in the usage by his time [583]. He has mentioned it as a part of the usage, *aśrāddhabhojī brāhmaṇaḥ* at three places (I. 101. 15f. 361., 21f. II., 109. 19).

P's silence about such a form (although he mentions (at 3. 2. 36). *asūryaṁpaśya-* of a similar type[584]), and non-attestation of the form in literature, together indicate that his usage, and probably that of Kty too, did not contain this form.

Obsn 149 : P (and probably also Kty) and Ptj used the form, *asūrya-ṁ-paśya-*

The foremost condition of compounding as laid down by P is proper syntactical relation between the components (*samarthaḥ pada-vidhiḥ*, 2.1.1). By that, a compound like *asūryaṁpaśya-* " not (ever) seeing the sun (being shut away in the inner apartments)" [585] becomes an incoherent compound, as the negative particle *a* is syntactically connected with √*dṛś*- and not with *sūrya*-. [586] — Still, (well knowing that there existed in his usage no idea or form as denoted by '*asūrya*-' [587] P has derived the compound, *asūrya-ṁ-paśya*-, with the suffix *khaś* attached to √*dṛś*- [588] preceded by the Upapada *asūrya*- (*asūrya-lalāṭayor dṛśi-tapoḥ* 3.2.36), This rule of P (besides his another rule, *suḍ anapuṁsakasya* 1.1.43), therefore, becomes indicative (*jñāpaka*) that a few such compounds were sanctioned by him as they enjoyed currency in the usage.

---

[577] As on the fortnightly fasting day of the Ekādaśī ! (NBh 174b).

[578] See Obsn **146.**

[579] By *tatpuruṣe tulyārtha*° .....(6.2.2).

[580] By 6.2.139 and 3.1.3.

[581] See discussion on the form, *apunargeya-*, at Obsn **51.**

[582] See Ptj. : *naña evāyaṁ bhuji-pratiṣedha-vācinaḥ śrāddha-śabdena*=*asamartha-samāsaḥ* (II.109.16f.); and Kai.: *bhujinā nañaḥ saṁbandho, na tu śrāddhena* (II.321a).

[583] See a fuller discussion on such forms at Obsn **51.**

[584] See Obsn **149.**

As for Ptj, he has used the form as a part of the usage, *asūryaṁpaśyāni mukhāni*, at three places (I. 101. 15, 361. 21, II. 109. 18f.). His attitude, however, has been seen to be discouraging a free use of such forms while granting sanction to a few cases that had already got established [588a] in the usage. [589] That indicates that the form was current also throughout the period intervening between P and Ptj.

asūryaṁpaśyā- is found to occur in *Naiṣadh* 19.36 and the *Viddhaśālabhañjikā* 186.6 (showing the *KV* usage: fn. 456) after IV. 3.

Obsn 150 : (i) P did not use the forms, *pāda-hāraka*- and *gale-copaka*-.
(ii) Kty used the first one, though not the second one also, and was perhaps aware of their objective sense.
(iii) Ptj used them in the objective sense.

In the context of P's rule (*kartṛ-karaṇe kṛtā bahulam* 2.1.32) enjoining compounding of forms ending in the instrumental case when it denotes the agent or the instrument (by *kartṛ-karaṇayos tṛtīyā* 2.3.18) with the Kṛt-s as the second member, — Kty expresses the necessity of a modification, of the first member being a form in **any** case; and he illustrates it by referring to the wanted forms 'like *pāda-hāraka-*'. (2.1.33.2[590] : *sādhanaṁ kṛtā=iti vā, pādahāraka =ādy-artham.*) (The '*bahulam*' in the Sūtra was probably not necessary according to this[591].) The "etc." ('*ādi*') in the Vt is expanded by Ptj to include the form *gale-copaka-*. —It is, therefore, obvious that Kty had felt that the compounding in such forms could not be normally had by the rules of P, not even by P's *bahula-grahaṇa*[592], and that hence he had framed his note to establish these forms. —Ptj's gloss shows that these forms were still current at his time. He dissolves them as *pādābhyāṁ*[593] *hriyate*, *pādahārakaḥ* "what is being taken away from the feet" and *gale*[594] *copyate*[595], *galecopakaḥ* "what is being pushed inside the throat" (I. 386.15f.). (*gala-* is not found with P or Kty, nor in the Veda.)

---

[585] On its quotation, *asūryaṁpaśyā rājadārāḥ*, *KV* (175) remarks : *guptiparaṁ caitat; evaṁ ca nāma guptā yad aparihāryadarśanaṁ sūryam api na paśyanti=iti. TattvaB* (494) adds : *kiṁ punaḥ parapuruṣam.*

[586] Cf. *KV* (175) : *asūrya iti cāsamarthasamāso 'yam; Ny* (565f.) : *atra hi darśanaṁ pratiṣidhyate, na tu sūrya eva; tasmād dṛśinaiva nañaḥ saṁbandhaḥ, na sūryeṇa=ity asāmarthyam;* Kaiy (II.321) : *sūrya-karmikayā dṛśikriyayā nañaḥ saṁbandho, na tu sūryasthayā sattayā=ity asāmarthyam;* and NBh (l.c.) : '*karmaṇi na prerayati=ity asūrya' ity artho na=iti bhāvaḥ.*

[587] See also BÖHTLINGK, *PGr* 478. However, the form appears, probably in the sense of "(a) sunless (world)," at *RV* 5.32.6 : *asūryé* (Sāyaṇa — '*sūryarahite*') *támasi vāvṛdhānám, Ṣaḍviṁśa Brāhmaṇa* 4(5).1 (with Sāyaṇa — '*na vidyate sūryo yasmin tat asūryaṁ naktam*'), and as *asurya- at ŚBr* 14.7.2.14 and *Īśopaniṣad* 3, the last two being paraphrased in the *Uttararāmacarita* IV.3.2-3.

[588] Substituted into *paśy* before a *ś-it* suffix, by 7.3.78.

[588a] Cp. for a basis, the *MBhr* line (3.59.19), *yāṁ na vāyur na cādityaḥ purā paśyati me priyām*, quoted by V. P. LIMAYE, *CSM*, p. 204.

[589] For a detailed discussion about the Jñāpana as well as for Ptj's views on it, see Obsn **51** on the form *apunargeya*-.

Ptj, however, again cites the same two forms, now to illustrate the diversity in the senses their suffix (*ṇvul*) conveys; he wants the expression of diversity not to be restricted to the Kṛtya and *lyuṭ* suffixes as was stated by P (*kṛtya-lyuṭo bahulam* 3. 3. 113), but to be extended [596] to any and every Kṛt suffix (*kṛto bahulam iti vaktavyam, pādahārakādyartham,* II. 155. 12). Here also he dissolves the compounds exactly in the same way. --But the diversity pointed out at 3. 3. 113 is of a different nature than the one at 2. 1. 32 (or 2. 1. 33. 2). Basically, it is the straying away from the sphere of operation primarily laid down of a subject by the governing general rule.[597] The Kṛt-s are generally known to carry the agent sense (*kartari kṛt* 3. 4. 67). But in the case of the present two forms ending in the suffix *ṇvul,* we see a peculiarity of the objective sense. [598] The purpose of Ptj's Vt here is, therefore, to sanctify the extraordinary usage of such forms showing neither a Kṛtya suffix nor the suffix *lyuṭ*.

---

[590] This should rather be 2.1.32.2.

[591] Cp. Ptj's expansion of the Vt: *athavā sādhanaṁ kṛtā saha samasyata iti vaktavyam. kiṁ prayojanam ?....* (I.386.14).

[592] *KV* (on 2.1.32), however, would get them by understanding P's '*bahulam*' as all-inclusive ! See : *sarvopādhi-vyabhicārārthaṁ bahula-grahaṇam* (89); and *PdM* (48) on it : *avyāpty-ativyāpti-parihārārtham ity arthaḥ.*

[593] This is the ablative case. See *Ny, PdM* (48), Kaiy (II.376b).

[594] Compounding, with the non-elision (*aluk*) of the locative case-affix, is had by *tatpuruṣe kṛti bahulam* (6.3.14), or by *amūrdhamastakāt svāṅgād akāme* (6.3.12), or, if the form were a name, by *haladantāt saptamyāḥ saṁjñāyām* (6.3.9).

[595] This is a causal from √*cup-* "to move slowly" (*DhP* 403 *cupa mandāyāṁ gatau*). For *copati*, see *MBhr* (3.297.42,43); and for *copaná-*, with the suffix (*yuc* 3.2.148) implied and the accent specified, see Ptj (II.10.1, III.112.1, 130.23).

[596] Cp. Kaiy (236b) : *vyāpakatvāt.*

[597] Cf. *KV* (on 3.3.108) *bahula-grahaṇaṁ vyabhicārārtham* (215); and on 3.3.113) .... *bahulam artheṣu bhavanti, yatra vihitās tato 'nyatrāpi bhavanti* (216).

[598] See *Ny*, *PdM* (48f.) and Kaiy (I.376b).

Thus, in the forms illustrated, we obtain instances of historical development in the semasiology of at least the suffix *ṇvul* though not of all the Kṛt suffixes as declared in the Vt of Ptj.

Neither of the forms is found attested in literature, Vedic or post-Vedic.

(Part II contd.)

A Brief Analysis of the Findings

A BRIEF ANALYSIS OF THE FINDINGS

The linguistic picture that emerges from the foregoing Observations shows two major types in which the cases fall :

Type I : Cases showing Continuity in Usage.

Type II : Cases showing Linguistic Change.

Each of these could be further categorised according to the peculiarities they reveal. Cases tending to belong to one of these types or to particular Categories under them, but still showing an amount of uncertainty, are collected at the end of them as ' Doubtful ' ones.

Cases (within the categories) are recorded in the order of 'Observations,' and so the first figure refers to the number of the Obsn in which the case falls. This, after a colon, is followed by another figure within brackets which serially numbers the total cases discussed in the order of the grammarians' recording.

Type I : CASES SHOWING CONTINUITY IN USAGE

(*Note* : The division of 173 cases here is recorded within brackets.)

Definite (123 in all)

1a. In Form : Positive	(63)
1b. In Form : Negative	(15)
2. In Sense	(13)
3. Mixed	(32)

Doubtful (50 in all)

1. In Form (Positive)	(29)
2. In Sense	(6)
3. Mixed	(9)
4. Other than Upapada-compounds	(3+2)
5. Secondary (?) Forms	(3+1)
6. Unanalysable (?) Forms	(—2)

(*Note* : For Cases, 11, 14, 17, 22, 74, 75, 79, 81–83, 113, 122, 123, 134, 136, 154, and 171–73, fn. 85 may be referred to.)

DEFINITE :

1a. In Form : Positive

3 : (1) *cetavya-*	(2) *paktavya-*
(3) *bhettavya-*	(4) *lavitavya-*
6 : (5) *carya-*	
10 : (6) *lavya-*	(7) *pavya-*
13 : (8) *ceya-*	
14 : (9) *gamya-*	
18 : (10) *vṛtya-*	
19 : (11) *ājya-*	
20 : (12) *kheya-*	
21 : (13) *saṁbhṛtya-*	(14) *saṁbhārya-*(*°yā-*) (adj., name)
27 : (15) *sṛjya-*	
30 : (16) *lāpya-*	
31 : (17) *dābhya-*	
32 : (18) *lāvya-*	(19) *pāvya-*
37 : (20) *samūhya-*	
39 : (21) *ghātya-*	
45 : (22) *bhāryā-*	
46 : (23) *gopya-*	
56 : (24) *adhyāyaka-*	(25) *kāraka-*
(26) *hāraka-*	(27) *pācaka-*
(28) *yājaka-*	
60 : (29) *parivrājaka-*	
61 : (30) *paktṛ-*	(31) *rantṛ-*
63 : (32) *paca-*	
64 : (33) *nadī-*	
66 : (34) *bhava-*	(35) *śarva-*
77 : (36) *giriśaya-*	
85 : (37) *°stha-* forms	
88 : (38) *jña-*	
94 : (39) *vinda-*	
102 : (40) *annāda-*	
103 : (41) *kumbhakāra-*	
124 : (42) *ātmaṁbhari-*	
126 : (43) *nāsikaṁdhama-*	(44) *stanaṁdhaya-*
(45) *nāḍiṁdhama-*	(46) *muṣṭiṁdhaya-*
127 : (47) *°manya-* forms	
134 : (48) *āḍhyaṁbhaviṣṇu-*	(49) *subhagaṁbhaviṣṇu-*
(50) *sthūlaṁbhaviṣṇu-*	(51) *palitaṁbhāviṣṇu-*
(52) *nagnaṁbhaviṣṇu-*	(53) *andhaṁbhaviṣṇu-*
(54) *priyaṁbhaviṣṇu-*	
136 : (56) *tādṛś-*	(55) *sadṛś-*
137 : (58) *tādṛśa-*	(57) *sadṛśa-*

138:(59) (Subanta + ***sadādi*** + ***kvip***)
140:(60) *āmād-* (61) *kravyād-*
142:(62) *sādhukārin-*
149:(63) *asūryampaśya-*

1b. In Form : Negative

30:(64) **lapya-*
31:(65) **dabhya-*
98:(66) **ādityadarśa-* (67) **grāmagama-*
(68) **himavacchrāva-*
104:(69) *mahākumbhakāra-* (as compound of three independent members)
105:(70) **kumbhīkāra-*
110:(71) Karmopapada °*cāra-* compounds (72) **kurucāra-* (Karmopapada)
(73) **pañcālacāra-* (Karmopapada)
138:(74) *duroṇasad-* (75) *vediṣad-*
140:(76) *kravyāda-*
145:(77) *bhojin-*
146:(78) **śrāddhabhojin-*

2. In Sense

15:(79) °*hátyā* action nouns
16:(80) *stutya-* (ordinary; necessity)
22:(81) *sūrya-* (agent)
25:(82) *kṛṣṭapacya-* (reflexive)
38:(83) *agnicityā-* (action)
50:(84) *geya-* (object; agent)
52:(85) *praiṣa* Kṛtya-s (86) non-*praiṣa* Kṛtya-s
54:(87) *vrajyā-* (action) (88) *ijyā-* (action)
(89) *samajyā-* (action)
115:(90) *jāyāghna-* (significant bodily mark; person having such) (91) *patighnī-* (significant bodily mark; person having such)

3. Mixed

'A' : Accent 'S' : Sense

AS **4**:(92) *janyà* (agent; object)
8:(93) *ajarya-* (agent with *saṁgata-*)
12:(94) *meya-* (95) *niceya-*
35:(96) *pāyya-* (97) *nikāyya-*
41:(98) *ācārya-*
AS**57**:(99) *nártaka-* (non-artisan) (100) *khánaka-* (non-artisan)
(101) *ráñjaka-* (-do-)
(102) *nártikā-* (non-artisan woman) (103) *khánikā-* (non-artisan woman)

(104) *ráñjikā-* (-do-)
(105) *nartakī́-* (non-artisan's wife) (106) *khānakī-* (non-artisan's wife)
(107) *rañjakī́-* (" " ")
78 : (108) *ajara-*
81 : (109) Subanta + *stha-* forms (agent)
92 : (110) *vyāghra-* (Saṁjñā)
AS96 : (111) *nártaka-* (artisan) (112) *khánaka-* (artisan)
(113) *ráñjaka-* (")
(114) *nartakī́-* (artisan woman) (115) *khanakī́-* (artisan woman)
(116) *rañjakī́-* (" ")
(117) *nartakī́-* (artisan's wife) (118) *khanakī́-* (artisan's wife)
(119) *rañjakī́-* (" ")
113 : (120) *surāpī-* ("drinking") (121) *sīdhupī-* ("drinking")
130 : (122) *suga-* (location) (123) *durga-* (location)

DOUBTFUL:

1. In Form (Positive)

42 : (124) *pravādya-* (125) *apavādya-*
43 : (126) *vārya-*
55 : (127) *āsaka-* (128) *śāyaka-*
61 : (129) *ādhyībhavitṛ-* (130) *āsitṛ-*
(131) *vikṣeptṛ-* (132) *śayitṛ-*
64 : (133) *corī-*
79 : (134) *meṣa-* (Unanalysable ?) (135) *deva-* (Secondary ?)
(136) *seva-*
86 : (137) *vikṣipa-* (138) *vilikha-*
89 : (139) *arthajña-*
93 : (140) *limpa-*
98 : (141) *vedādhyāya-* (142) *chatradhāra-*
(143) *dvārapāla-* (144) *bhārahāra-*
(145) *bhāravāha-*
103 : (146) *nagarakāra-*
111 : (147) *cārvāghāta-*
116 : (148) *śaśaghnī-*
121 : (149) *śrāddhakara-* (150) *piṇḍakara-*
127 : (151) *°manyá-* forms
144 : (152) *sthaṇḍilaśāyin-*

2. In Sense

22 : (153) *rucya-* (agent)
23 : (154) *avyathya-* (agent)
73 : (155) *pārśvaśaya-* (location) (156) *pṛṣṭhaśaya-* (location)
(157) *udaraśaya-* (location)
84 : (158) *kumuda-* (Etymology ?)

3. Mixed

6:(159) *ācarya-*
92:(160) **ghrāya-* (non-name) (161) *jighra-* (non-name)
(162) *vijighra-* („) (163) *vyājighra-* („)
109:(164) *sūtragrāha-* (" non-wearing ")
112:(165) *varṇasaṁghāta-* (166) *padasaṁghāta-*
122:(167) *śaṁkarī-* (non-name)

4. Other than Upapada-compounds

15:(168) *śvahatyā-* (169) *dasyuhatyā-*
40:(170) *śvaghātya-*
112:(165) *varṇasaṁghāta-* (?) (166) *padasaṁghāta-* (?)

5. Secondary (?) Forms

2:(171) *vāstavya-*
5:(172) *vadhya-*
77:(173) *giriśa-*
79:(135) *deva-*

6. Unanalysable (?) Forms

22:(81) *sūrya-*
79:(134) *meṣa-*

Type II : CASES SHOWING LINGUISTIC CHANGE

1. By 'Linguistic Change' are understood all kinds of linguistic innovations **including** the currency of entirely new forms (their earlier absence being indicated with **a dash**).

2. In the first place, cases are divided into two major Categories : —

   'A' : containing cases where (disregarding the Veda) the first change appears (probably) at the time of Kty.

   'B' : containing cases where the first change appears following Kty.

3. Within these two, there is a division into sub-classes which are shown according to the kind of historical course seen in the cases.

   (i) The sub-classes show the various historical stages, which are marked off with a hyphen (-).

   (ii) **Historical Stages** are symbolised thus :

'P' for Pāṇini,	'K' for Kātyāyana,
'Pt' for Patañjali,	'V' for the Veda;

   — a stage intervening any two of these is shown by bringing the symbols for the two close to eachother. (Thus, 'PK' would indicate a stage between the times of 'P' and 'K'.) Sometimes there is another intervening stage immediately following the first, which is shown by a slanting stroke above the second of these two stages (cf. KPt′).

   (iii) A figure attached to these symbols indicates the **Linguistic Stage** shown by the form.

   (iv) It needs to be pointed out here that the so-called 'intervening' historical stage could, in reality, have been only synchronous with the so-called 'following' stage when the Linguistic Change was noted, and that it could then be understood as reflecting only the **contemporary geographical (or dialectal) variation** instead of the historical one, i. e. only linguistic diffusion rather than linguistic history.

4. The following is the **List of Sub-classes** into which the cases of linguistic variation fall.

(*Note* : 'D' stands for Doubtful.

The division of 198 (152 + D 46) cases here is recorded within brackets.)

A. (96+D 16) :	1a.	$P_1-K_2-Pt_2$	(75+D 11)
	1b.	$P_1-K_2-KPt_2-Pt_2$	(6+D 2)
	1c.	$V_1-P_1-K_2-Pt_2$	(3)
	2a.	$V_1-P_2-K_1-Pt_1$	(6)
	2b.	$V_1-P_2-K_1-KPt_1-Pt_1$	(1)
	3.	$P_1-PK_2-K_1-Pt_1$	(3+D 3)
	4.	$P_1-K_2-Pt_1$	(2)
B. (56+D 30) :	1a.	$P_1-K_1-KPt_2-Pt_2$	(8+D 1)
	1b.	$P_1-K_1-KPt_2-KPt'_3-Pt_3$	(1+D 1)
	2.	$P_1-K_1-KPt_2-Pt_1$	(1)
	3.	$P_1+K_1-Pt_2$	(46+D 28)

5. Within the sub-classes, the **Linguistic peculiarities** shown by forms are indicated before the first figure (that shows the number of Obsn), with

'F' for Form, 'S' for Sense,

'M' for Mixed (i. e. showing at the same time peculiarities of 'F' and 'S'), and

'A' for Accent.

6. **Cases are listed in the first Linguistic Stages** of the forms, followed sometimes within brackets by an indication of their development in the subsequent L. Stage (s). Hence, where new forms apparently developed at L. Stage no. 2, a blank in the form of **a dash** (—) is shown to represent L. Stage no. 1. (See Note 1.)

7. For Sub-classes, A. 2a, 2b, 3, 4 and B. 2 (i. e. for Cases, 271–85 and 297), **fn. 143 may be referred to.**

8. For Cases 206, 208, 220, 244, 245, 247, 253, 267, 271–77, 292, 308 and 337, **fn. 85 may be referred to.**

A. 1a. **/ P_1–K_2–Pt_2 /**

F **1**:(174) — ($>^0$ (*k*)*elima*(*r*)–forms (OR at the still next Historical Stage : SEE fn. **114**; ALSO : fn. **113.**)
AS **4**:(175) — (> *jányа–* : object)
F **17**:(176) — (> *avaśyastutya–*)
F **28**:(177) **pāṇisṛjya–* (?) (> *pāṇisargya–*)
F **33**:(178) — (> *avaśyalāvya–*)
(179) — (> *avaśyapāvya–*)
(180) — (> *avaśyabhāvya–*)
S **44**:(181) *bhārya–* (Saṁjñā)
M **59**:(182) **prāvaka–* (183) *sāraka–*
(184) *lāvaka–*
F **62**:(185) ^{0}*a*(*c*)– forms

F 67:(186) *śaktigrāha-* (>° *aha-*) (187) *lāṅgalagrāha-* (>° *aha-*)
(188) *aṅkuśagrāha-* (>° *aha-*) (189) *yaṣṭigrāha-* (>° *aha-*)
(190) *tomaragrāha-* (>° *aha-*) (191) *ghaṭagrāha-* (>° *aha-*)
(192) *ghaṭīgrāha-* (>° *aha-*) (193) *dhanurgrāha-* (>° *aha-*)
M **68**:(194) — (> *sūtragraha-*)
S **69**:(195) *stamberama-* (196) *karṇejapa-*
F **74**:(197) — (> *digdhasahaśaya-*)
F **75**:(198) — (> *uttānaśaya-*)
S **81**:(199) Subanta + *stha-* forms [agent] (> ...... [+action])
S **83**:(200) *tundaparimṛja-* (201) *śokāpanuda-*
F **84**:(202) — (⋟ *mūlavibhuja-*)
M **90**:(203) Upapada other than *sīdhu-* or *surā-* + *pi-* ("drinking")
(204) any Upapada + *pī-* (" protecting")
F **94**:(205) — (>+ *govinda-*)
F **95**:(206) rarity of *tana-* (207) — (> *tāna-*)
(208) — (> *avatāna-*)
M **97**:(209) *pravaka-* (210) *saraka-*
(211) *lavaka-*
A**F100**:(212) *māṁsaśīlī-* (>°*saśīlā-*) (213) *māṁsakāmī́-* (>° *sákāmā-*)
(214) *māṁsabhakṣī-* (>°*sábhakṣā* -) (215) *kalyāṇācārī́-*(>°*yā́ṇācārā-*)
(216) *sukhapratīkṣī́-* (>°*khápratīkṣā-*) (217) *kalyāṇakṣamī́-* (>°*yā́ṇakṣamā-*)
(But SEE fn. 403.)
M**108**:(218) — (>*tundaparimārja-*) (219) — (>*śokāpanoda-*)
M**111**:(220) — (>*dārvāghāṭa-*) (221) — (>*cārvāghāṭa-*)
F**112**:(222) — (>°*saṁghāṭa-* forms)
F**117**:(223) — (>*rājagha-*)
M**120**:(224) (*kiṁkarī-* (>*kiṁkarā-*) (225) *yatkarī-* (>*yatkarā-*)
(226) *tatkarī-* (>*tatkarā-*) (227) *bahukarī-* (>*bahukarā-*)
S**123**: (228) *stambakari-* (> *stambakāra-?*) (229) *śakṛtkari-* (>*śakṛtkāra-?*
F**124**:(230) — (>*kukṣiṁbhari-*)
F**125**:(231) — (>*vātamaja-*) (232) — (>*śuniṁdhaya-*)
(233) — (>*tilaṁtuda-*) (234) — (>*śardhaṁjaha-*)
F**126**:(235) — (>*muṣṭiṁdhama-*)
F **128**:(236) — (>[Subanta] + *ṁ* + *gama-*)
F**129**:(237) — (>*vihaṁgama-*) (238) — (>*vihaṁga-*)
F **130**:(239) — (> *vihaga-*) (240) — (> *sarvatraga-*)
(241) — (> *pannaga-*) (242) — (> *uraga-*)
(243) — (> *nirga-*)
F **136**:(244) — (> *anyādṛś-*) (Secondary ? Unanalysable ?)
F **137**:(245) — (> *anyādṛśa-*) (Secondary ? Unanalysable ?)
S **142**:(246) — (Ṇinyanta Upapada-compounds in Habit S)
S **143**:(247) *brahmavādin-*
F**150**:(248) — (> *pādahāraka-*)

DOUBTFUL:

F **1**:(249) — (> *pacelima-*) (250) — (> *bhidelima-*)
M **69**:(251) **stambarama-* (>—>—)
(252) *karṇajapa-* (>—>—)
F **71**:(253) — (> *śaṁbhava-*)
F **76**:(254) — (> *avamūrdhaśaya-*)
F **91**:(255) — (>° *pā-* names)
F**112**:(256) — (> *varṇasaṁghāṭa-*) (257) — (> *padasaṁghāṭa-*)
F**114**:(258) — (> °*pī-* names)
F**128**:(259) — (> *mitaṁgama-*)

A. 1b. / P_1-K_2-KPt_2-Pt_2 /

F**133**:(260) *āḍhyaṁkaraṇā-* (>° *ṇī-*) (261) *sthūlaṁkaraṇā-* (>° *ṇī-*)
(262) *palitaṁkaraṇā-* (>° *ṇī-*) (263) *nagnaṁkaraṇā-* (>° *ṇī-*)
(264) *andhaṁkaraṇā-* (>° *ṇī-*) (265) *priyaṁkaraṇā-* (>° *ṇī-*)

DOUBTFUL :

F**132**:(266) *āhva-* (267) *brahmajya-*

A. 1c. / V_1-P_1-K_2-Pt_2 /

F **26** : (268) *pratigṛhya-*(>°*grāhya-*) (269) *apigṛhya-*(>°*grāhya-*)
F **27** : (270) *samavasṛjya-*(>°*sargya-*)

A. 2a. / V_1-P_2-K_1-Pt_1 /

AS **7** : (271) *aryá-* (> *árya-* > *aryá-*)
A **25** : (272) *kṛṣṭapacyá-* (>° *pácya-* >° *pacyá-*)
A **36** : (273) *kuṇḍapā́yya-* (>° *pāyyà-* >° *pā́yya-*)
A **38** : (274) *agnicityā́-* (>° *tyā̀-* >° *tyā́-*)
F **93** : (275) *nilimpa-* (> -- > *nilimpa-*)
A**135**:(276) *dadhṛ́ṣ-* (> *dádhṛṣ-* > *dadh ́ṣ-*)

A. 2b. / V_1-P_2-K_1-KPt_1-Pt_1 /
F**133**:(277) *subhagaṁkaraṇī-* (>° *ṇā-* >° *ṇī-*)

A. 3. / P_1-PK_2-K_1-Pt_1 /
S **53**:(278) Tṛjādyanta forms (Time)
S **55**:(279) Tṛjādyanta forms (Transitive nature)
F **80**:(280) *budha-* (>—> *budha-*)

DOUBTFUL :

F **80**:(281) *bhida-* (>—> *bhida-*) (282) *yudha-* (>—> *yudha-*)
(283) *siva-* (>—> *siva-*)

A. 4. / P_1-K_2-P_1 /

S **54**:(284) *vrajyā-* (action > location > action)
(285) *ijyā-* (action > location > action)

B. 1a. / P_1-K_1-KPt_2-Pt_2 /

F **4**:(286) — (> *yatya-*)
M **11**:(287) *āneya-*
M **34**:(288) *ānāyya-*
F105:(289) — (> *kāsakaṭikāra-*)
F131:(290) — (> *stryagāraga-*) (291) — (> *grāmaga-*)
(292) — (> *gurutalpaga-*)
F131:(293) absence of numerous °*gi-* forms (> currency of such)

DOUBTFUL :

F134:(294) absence (?) of *anāḍhyaṁbhaviṣṇú-* (> its currency)

B. 1b. / P_1-K_1-KPt_2-KPt_3-Pt_3 /

A **48**:(295) *amāvásyā-* (> *amāvásyā* · >° *vasyā̀-*, *vā̀syā̀-*)

DOUBTFUL :

F **101**:(296) *ambhobhigāmī-* (?) (>° *gamā-* >° *gāmī-*)

B. 2. / P_1-K_1-KPt_2-Pt_1 /

M **72**:(297) *śaṁkarā-* (: *śaṁgarā-* > *sáṁkarā-*)

B. 3. / P_1-K_1-Pt_2 /

F **4**: (298) — (> *takya-*) (299) — (> *śasya-*)
(300) — (> *catya-*)
M **9**: (301) — (> *upaceyapṛḍa-*)
F **13**: (302) — (> *ditsya-*) (303) — (> *dhitsya-*)
(304) — (> *anubhavya-*)
F **30**: (305) — (> *apalāpya-*)
F **31**: (306) — (> *avadābhya-*)
M47: (307) *kṛṣṭapacya-* (>° *pākya-*)
S **49** : (308) *upacāyyapṛḍa-*
F **51**: (309) — (> *apunargeya-*)
S **54**: (310) *samajyā-* (action > location)
F 56:(311) — (> *vikṣepaka-*) (312) — (> **vilekhaka-*)
AM58:(313) —(>+ *hvā́yaka/vā́yaka-*) (non-artisan)
(314) — (>+ *hvā́yikā-/vā́yikā-*) (non-artisan woman)
(315) — (>+ *hvāyakī́-/vāyakī́-*) (non-artisan's wife)

F 61:(316) — (> *ajaritṛ-*)
(317) — (> *japitṛ-*)   (318) — (> **vilekhitṛ-*)
F 81:(319) — (> *ākhūttha-*)   (320) — (> *śyenottha-*)
(321) — (> *śalabhottha-*)
F 94:(322) — (> *aravinda-*)   (323) — (> *vinda-* names)
AM96:(324) — (>+*hvā́yaka-* / *vā́yaka-* (artisan)
(325) — (>+ *hvā́yikā-* / *vā́yikā-* (artisan woman)
(326) — (>+ *hvāyakī́-* / *vāyakī́-*) (artisan's wife)
F 98:(327) — (> *carcāpāra-*)   (328) — (> *śamanīpāra-*)
M118:(329) — (> *kurucara-*)   (330) — (> *pañcālacara-*)
F126:(331) — (> *nāsikaṁdhaya-*)   (332) — (> *nāḍiṁdhaya-*)
(333) — (> *ghaṭiṁdhama-*)   (334) — (> *ghaṭiṁdhaya-*)
(335) — (> *khāriṁdhama-*)   (336) — (> *khāriṁdhaya-*)
F132:(337) — (> *prahva-*)
F141:(338) — (> *udāsāriṇī-*)   (339) — (> *pratyāsāriṇī-*)
F142:(340) — (> *sādhudāyin-*)
F147:(341) — (> *nagaraghāta-*)
F148:(342) — (> *aśrāddhabhojin-*)
F150:(343) — (> *galecopaka-*)

DOUBTFUL: (Also SEE fn. 114.)

F 5:(344) — (> *asivadhya-*)   (345) — (> *musalavadhya-*)
(Secondary ?)   (Secondary ?)
F 52:(346) — (> *busopendhya-*)   (347) — (> *tṛṇopendhya-*)
(348) — (> *ghanaghātya-*)
F 65:(349) — (> *jārabharā-*)   (350) — (> *śvapacā-*)
F 70:(351) — (> *śaṁvada-*)
F 82:(352) — (> *kacchapa-*)   (353) — (> *kaṭāhapa-*)
(354) — (> *dvipa-*)
F 84:(355) — (> *nakhamuca-*)   (356) — (> *kākaguha-*)
(357) — (> *sarasīruha-*)
F 85:(358) — (> *śaṁstha-*)
F 87:(359) — (> *sugla-*)   (360) — (> *sumla-*)
F 98:(361) — (> *kamaṇḍalugrāha-*)   (362) — (> *uṣṭrapraṇāya-*)
F 99:(363) — (> *odanapāca-*)   (364) — (> *kāṣṭhabheda-*)
(365) (> *kuḍyalepa-*)   (366) — (> *vaḍavāsaṁdāya-*)
AF100(367) *sukhapratīkṣī́-* ($>^0$ *khápratīkṣā-*)
(368) *kalyāṇakṣamī́-* ($>^0$ *yā́ṇakṣamā-*)
(SEE fn. 403.)
F106:(369) — (> *kāṇḍalāva-*)
F107:(370) — (> *grāmaṇāya-*)
F139:(371) — (> *śaṁsthā-*)

Part III

Indices and Appendices

I

A POST-SCRIPT

Page 5, Line 11. Cp. RENOU here, "The Valid Forms in "Bhāṣā" (in the works of Sanskrit grammarians)," *IHQ* (1941) 17. 245-50 :— (P. 248 :) "the grammar of Pāṇini does not concern the bhāṣā *alone* but quite a common language, absorbing chandas and bhāṣā....which absorbs in a single description facts of chandas and elements of spoken language..." (P. 249 :) "... isolating the chandas only where there are peculiarities decidedly abolished .... isolating the bhāṣā there only where the exigencies of the system led to upset a sūtra of the chandas. The chandas therefore do not represent in any way a state of language distinct from the normal; it is in the interior of a common language, a fringe of archaisms or "diversities," which for some reason or other mark the margin of a system. Only those forms are specified as Vedic that cannot be arrived at by the ordinary rules of grammar." He explains his translation "spoken language" for 'bhāṣā' thus (p 248, fn. 1) : "The word bhāṣā .... It is perhaps (in part at least) the spoken portion of the religious language, opposed to the sung or psalmed portion represented by the chandas. One must not forget that the grammar of Pāṇini is adapted to the needs of the exegetic prose and ritual much more than to those of a "common" language."

Pages 20-21. On the implications of non-attestation, see also Jayapala VIDYALANKARA, "Kātyāyana ke Kālanirdhāraṇa mẽ Devānāṁpriya Śabda kā Mahattva" ("Importance of the word *devānāṁpriya* for Ascertaining the Age of Kātyāyana") (in Hindi), *Journal of the Department of Sanskrit,* University of Delhi, Vol. 1, No. 2, July 1972, pp. 106-21 : p. 115.

Page 46. CSM : Published, 1974.

Page 48. **Add** the following :

Pādatāḍitakam, ed. G. H. SCHOKKER, *The Pādatāḍitaka of Śyāmilaka,* Part I, Indo-Iranian Monographs, Vol. 9, Mouton & Co., The Hague, Paris, 1966. (**Reference** to a stanza followed by a prose-sentence.)

Padmaprābhṛtakam, ed. J. R. A. LOMAN, *The Padmaprābhṛtakam, An Ancient Bhāṇa Ascribed to Śūdraka,* Amsterdam, 1956. (**Reference** to a stanza followed by a prose-sentence.)

Page 49. **Add** the following :

Mahāvīracariyaṁ (*Gosālagacariajutto Chaṭṭho Patthāvo*), pub. by the Prakrit Vidya Mandal, L. D. Institute of Indology, Ahmedabad-9, 1965 (giving **reference** to the page and line).

Page 57, Line 2. **Add** at the end fn. 120a as follows :

A similar use of the Prakrit counterpart, *vatthavva-,* is to be found in the line, *tattheva pure vatthavvo maṁkhalī nāma gihavaī,* from the *Mahāvīracariya* of Guṇacaṁda (6. 6).

Page 65, Line 16. **Add** at the end fn. 143a as follows :

However, Sukumar SEN points out (*Paninica,* Calcutta, 1970, p. 17) :—"In the sense of 'employer' (*svāmin*) it occurs in Asokan : *bhata-m-ayesu* ('among the employees and the employers')."

Page 72, fn. 158. 'close position' : i.e. *Sāhacarya* or Contiguity. See, in this connection, fn. 56-(iii).

Page 73, fn. 161. **aṅgya-* : Implied by *TattvaB.*

Page 86, Line 24. Actually, there is nothing unhistorical about it. (See fn. 143.) The fact is that it goes against the finding that there is generally full concurrence between Ptj and the author of the Śt-Vt. (See fns. 196,535.)

Page 87, fn. 198. **Add :** of the root √*pā-*.

Page 87, Line 24. On 'drunk,' **add** fn. 199a as follows :

pāyya- within this compound form has been interpreted (— see fns. 199, 201 —) as having nothing to do with its independent occurrence recorded by P at 3.1.129.

Page 89, Line 2. **Add** the following :

Thus, the sacrificial terms, which at P's time were simultaneously current in the secular usage as well, were uttered (1) with the accentual peculiarity (indicated by the context of the suffix) in the secular usage, but (2) with their correct Vedic accent (as noted by Kty) in the context of the sacrificial ceremonies.

Page 117, Line 24. **Add** on the last word :

Also, as a vocative (*cori*), in fondly addressing a girl ("You sweet thief !"), occurs in the *Padmaprābhṛtakam* (25.30, 27.1, 38.17) and the *Pādatāḍitakam* (69.12, 100b).

Page 129, fn. 314. It can be a printing mistake, with the cedilla mark being left out.

Page 131, Lines 12, 22. Suggested by M. A. MEHENDALE.

Page 139, fn. 331. See (in the above context) S. D. LADDU, "A Possible Light on the Relative Age of Yāska and Patañjali," *VIJ* (Hoshiarpur), Vol. V, Pt i, March 1967, pp. 58-62.

Page 163, Lines 9-11 and end-lines.

Thus, the *KV* and *PdM* interpretation, of the possibility of *lavakā-* (*vun*: 3.1.149) expressing repetition of an act, to develop the meaning of well-doing or skill (or to enter into the sphere of *lavakī-* showing *ṣvun* : 3.1.145) within the short period of man's habit-formation, is not quite possible; but such a development can be expected at the time of Kty coming after a long period.

Page 170, Line 26. **Add** at the end :

Also, the component **saṁda-*, seen in the optionally compounded form from the fifth pair is not attested in literature.

Page 199, Line 6. **Add** at the end :

Perhaps this implies that, in the *Hetvādi* senses, Kty (and Ptj) continued to have P's usage with *īkārānta* in the case of these four forms.

Page 232, Line 18. **Add** after '(1.1)' :

And, in the fem. (°*nī*-), at *BĀrUp* 4.5.1.

Page 239, Line 2.

The Vt is quoted by Ptj at II.82.19f. See fn. 133-(i).

Page 244, against (102) : 40. **Add** *annādī*-.

Page 244, last two Lines.

Read the lines, containing Cases 55-58, **on** Page 247, **under** Section **5.**

Page 246, after Line 14. **Add** the following :

119 : (372) *bhikṣācara*- (containing a Karmopapada).

Page 247, after Line 6. **Add** the following :

120 : (373) *kiṁkarī*- (in Hetvādi S)
(374) *yatkari*- („ „)
(375) *tatkarī*- („ „)
(376) *bahukarī*- („ „)

Page 247, Line 7.

Read this line, containing Cases 168 and 169, **on** Page 245, **under** Section **3.**

Page 249. **Add** (after Note 8), **Note 9,** as follows :

9. For an explanation of the linguistic development in Cases 182-85, 203, 204, 206, 209-11, 246, 266, 267, 278, 279, 287 and 288, reference may be made to the discussions thereupon.

Page 249, after Line 8 from below. **Add** the following :

M 24 : (377) *kupya*-

II

INDEX TO FREE AND SOPAPADA KṚDANTA-S

(Including the Negatives)

Also showing their Position in the Linguistic Evolution and Literary Attestation

- Reference to a form primarily points out

(1) the number of Observation where it is discussed : this is indicated with a figure in bold type;

(2) its position within the linguistic picture as recorded in *A Brief Analysis of the Findings* : this is indicated by giving a figure enclosed within round brackets, as is done in *A Brief Analysis.*

- Reference to a form mentioned (only or also) casually is also indicated. This is done (1) by giving the page number, with 'p' preceding that number; (2) by adding 'n' after it, in case it occurs only within a footnote on that page; and (3) by adding a comma, a hyphen, and 'n' after it, in case it occurs also within a footnote on the same page.

- Attestation of forms is indicated as much as possible, with the use of the following symbols in the preceding margin :

E, for one occurring only in Early literature;
C, for „ „ only in Classical literature;
L, for „ „ only in Lexicons; and
×, for „ not attested in literature.

- Explanation of symbols following the forms :

(N) : Nipātana form;
(IRR) : Irregular form;
(v.l.) : variant reading;
[PS] : Reference to be made to *A Post-Script;*
III : Reference to be made to the *Index of Forms Not Used As Free or Sopapada Kṛdanta-s;*
(?) : Uncertainty as to its (Free or Sopapada) Kṛdanta nature; hence read also under 'III'.

- For fear of unclear printing, accent marks are mostly omitted in the list.

(A) Individual Forms

a-kupya- p 77
a-kopya- p 77
a-gamya-, *°yā-* **14**, p 68f; III
× *agnicitya-* p 90n
E *agnicītyā*, **38**, (83), (274), p 24, p 26f, p 222n
× *aṅkuśagraha-* (in agent sense) **67**, (188)
× *aṅkuśagrāha-* **67**, 188
**aṅgya-* p 73n, p 258
a-jara- **78**, (108), p 25, p 27, p 65; III
× *a-jaritṛ-* **61**, (316), p 27, p 65
E *a-jarya-* (N) **8**, (93), p 132
× *a-jārya-* p 24, p 66n
× **ajya-* (Intended ?) **19**, p 74
aṭā- p 139n
ada-, *adā-* p 176f

a-dābhya- p 24
E *adhyāyaka-* **56**, **53**, p 24f
× *a-nagnaṁbhaviṣṇu-* p 220f
× *an-andhaṁbhaviṣṇu-* p 220f
× *an-āḍhyaṁbhaviṣṇu-* **134**, (294), p 29
an-āhantṛ- p 42
anucarya- p 64n
× *anubhavya-* **13**, (304)
E *anuvinda-* **94**, (323), p 153
C *andhaṁkaraṇa-* **133**, p 219
× *andhaṁkaraṇā-* **133**, (264)
C *andhaṁkaraṇī-* **133**, (264)
C *andhaṁbhaviṣṇu-* **134**, (53); *an°* s.v.
annāda- **102**, (40)
annādī- p 175f
anyādṛś- (?) **136**, (244), p 24
anyādṛśa- (?) **137**, **136**, (245), p 24
a-paca- p 117
a-patighnī- p 194
× *apunargeya-* (IRR) **51**, (309), p 237n
p 167n, p 172n
× *a-palitaṁbhaviṣṇu-* p 220f
× *apavādya-* **42**, (125)
E *apigṛhya-* **26**, (269)
× *apigrāhya-* **26**, (269), p 27, p 96
× *apunargeya-* (IRR) **51**, (309), p 237n
× *a-priyaṁbhaviṣṇu-* p 220f
abhigama- p 175, -n; III
amāvasya- (N), *°yā-* **48**, (295)
amāvāsya-, *°yā-* **48**, (295)
E *amitraghāta-* p 236n
× *ambhobhigāma-* **101**, (296)
× *ambhobhigāmī-* **101**, (296), p 173n
ayoghana- p 104
aravinda- **94**, (322); m., n. p 153n
arthajña- **89**, **99**, (139); III
E *arya-* (N) **7**, (271), p 24, p 26f, p 222n,
(**Also**, *aya-* at end.)
× **avatana-* p 24, p 155
avatāna- **95**, (208); III
× *avadābhya-* **31**, (306), p 29, p 83, p 137n,
p 167n, p 172n
× *avamūrdhaśaya-* **76**, (254)
× *avalāpya-* (v.l.) p 29, p 82f
avaśyakārya- p 85
× *avaśyapāvya-* **33**, (179), p 85n
× *avaśyabhāvya-* **33**, (180)
× *avaśyalāvya-* **33**, (178), p 85n
**avaśyastāvya-* p 85n
× *avaśyastutya-* **17**, **33**, (176), p 71
avaśyānuṣṭheya° III
× *avasaṁsargya-* p 82
avasarga- p 82
× *avasargya-* p 82
a-vikṣipa- p 146
a-vilikha- p 146
E *a-vyathya-* (N) **23**, (154), p 24
× *aśrāddhabhojin-* (IRR) **148**, (342)
aṣṭāpṛḍa- p 99n
× *a-subhagaṁbhaviṣṇu-* p 220f
C *asūryaṁpaśya-* (IRR) **149**, (63)
asūryaṁpaśyā- p 238
× *a-sthūlaṁbhaviṣṇu-* p 220f
ākhuhan- p 42
× *ākhūttha-* **81**, (319), p 29
ācarya- (in *M* sense) **61**, (159), p 91n
ācārya- **41**, (98), p 27, p 63
ā'jya- **19**, (11), p 24
× *āḍhyaṁkaraṇā-* **133**, (260)
× *āḍhyaṁkaraṇī-* **133**, (260)
× *āḍhyaṁbhaviṣṇu-* **134**, (48); *an°* s.v.
× *āḍhyībhavitṛ-* **61**, (129), p 42
× **āḍhyībhaviṣṇu-* p 149n
C *ātmaṁbhari-* (N) **124**, (42)
× **ādityadarśa-* **98**, (66)
× *ānāyya-* (N) **34**, (288), p 67
āneya- **11**, **34**, (287), p 25
āmād- **140**, (60), p 25
ārya- p 25, p 42, p 64
× *āsaka-* **55**, (127), p 111n
āsanastha- p 139
× *āsitṛ-* **61**, (130), p 25
× *āsthāyin-* **144**, p 232-234
× **āhuva-* p 214-216
āhū- p 217n
āhva- **132**, (266)
× *ijyā-* **54**, (88), (285)
C *uttānaśaya-* **75**, (198)
× *udaraśaya-* **73**, (157)
× *udāsāriṇī-* **141**, (338)
unmeṣa- p 133
upacarya- p 64n
upacāyya- (N) p 97-99
E *upacāyyapṛḍa-* (N) **49**, (308), p 24,
p 66
upacāyyamṛḍa- p 99n
× *upaceya-* p 98, p 99n
× *upaceyapṛḍa-* **9**, **49**, (301)
× *upeddha-* p 105
× *upendhya-* p 105
uraga- **130**, (242)
× *uṣṭrapraṇāya-* **98**, (362), p 29, p 83n,
p 137n, p 172n
odanapāca- **99**, (363)
kacchapa- **82**, (352), p 24, p 28
kacchapī- p 140
× *kaṭāhapa-* **82**, (353)
× *kamaṇḍalugrāha-* **98**, (361)
C *karṇajapa-* **69**, (252)
C *karṇejapa-* **69**, (196)

× _karmasaṁghāṭa-_ p 187n
× _karmasaṁghāta-_ p 187n
kalyāṇakṣama- p 155
× _kalyāṇakṣamā-_ **100**, (217), (368)
× _kalyāṇakṣamī-_ **100**, (217), (368)
kalyāṇācāra- p 155
× _kalyāṇācārā-_ **100**, (215)
× _kalyāṇācārī-_ **100**, (215)
× _kākaguha-_ **84**, (356)
kākaguhā- p 143
× *_kākagoha-_ p 144
× *_kākagohā-_ p 144
× _kāṇḍalāva-_ **106**, (369), p 25, p 173n, p 175n
kāma- p 173n
kāraka- **56**, (25), p 25
× _kāśakaṭīkāra-_ **105**, (289)
× _kāṣṭhabheda-_ **99**, (364)
kiṁkara- p 199
× _kiṁkarā-_ **120**, (224), p 135
kiṁkarī- **120**, (224), (373) [PS]
C _kukṣiṁbhari-_ **124**, (230), p 25
× _kuḍyalepa-_ **99**, (365)
E _kuṇḍapāyya-_ (N) **36**, (273), p 24, p 26f, p 90, p 222n
kupinda- p 152n
kupya- (N) **24**, (377) [PS], p 25f, p 95, p 222n; _a_° s.v.; III
kumāraghātin- p 42
kumuda- (?) **84**, (158), p 24; III
kumudā- p 143
kumbhakāra- **103**, (31), p 168
× *_kumbhīkāra-_ **105**, (70)
× _kurucara-_ **118**, (329); III
kurucarī- p 197n
× *_kurucāra-_ **110**, (72)
kuruvinda- **94**, (323), p 153
kuvinda- p 152n
kṛṣṭapacya- (N) **25**, **47**, (82), (272), (307), p 24, p 26f, p 96, p 222n
× _kṛṣṭapākya-_ **47**, (307), p 27
× _kopya-_ p 76f; _a_° s.v.
kravyād- **140**, (61)
kravyāda- **140**, (76)
kṣīrapa- p 190
kṣīrapā- **90**, **113**, (203), p 27
kṣīrahārī- p 168
khanaka- **96**, (112)
khanakī- **96**, (115), (118)
× _khariṁdhama-_ (v.l.) p 29, p 206,-n
× _khariṁdhaya-_ (v.l.) p 29, p 206,-n
khānaka- **57**, **96**, (100); III
khānakī- **57**, **96**, (106)
khānikā- **57**, **96**, (103)
× _khāriṁdhama-_ **126**, (335)
× _khāriṁdhaya-_ **126**, (336)
gamin- p 164n
gamya- **14**, (9), p 25; _a_° s.v.
gamyā- **14**, p 68; _a_° s.v.; III
giriśa- (?) **77**, (173), p 24, p 26
giriśaya- **77**, (36), p 27, p 124n
giristhāyin- p 234
gurutalpaga- **131**, (292) p 24
× _geya-_ (in agent sense) (N) **50**, (84), p 58n, p 101
goda- p 35
*_godāya-_ p 35
gopya- **46**, (23), p 25, p 27, p 76f
govinda- **94**, (205)
× *_goveda-_ p 27, p 152
× _grāmaga-_ **131**, (291)
× *_grāmagāma-_ **98**, (67)
× _grāmaṇāya-_ **107**, (370), p. 25, p 167n
grāmaṇī- p 182
× _grāmanāya-_ p 44, p 182n
grāhin- p 116n
× _ghaṭagraha-_ **67**, (191)
× _ghaṭagrāha-_ **67**, (191)
× _ghaṭiṁdhama-_ **126**, (333), p 120n
ghaṭiṁdhaya- **126**, (334), p 120n
× _ghaṭīgraha-_ **67**, (192)
× _ghaṭīgrāha-_ **67**, (192)
ghana- p 104f
ghātya- **39**, (21), p 105; III
× *_ghrāya-_ **92**, (160), p 27
× _catya-_ **4**, (300)
× _carcāpāra-_ **98**, **53**, (327)
carya- **6**, (5)
× *_cātya-_ p 60
E _cāruvinda-_ **94**, (323), p 153
cārya- p 63
× _cārvāghāṭa-_ **111**, (221)
× _cārvāghāta-_ **111**, (147)
citya- (N) p 90n
cetavya- **3**, (1), p 25
ceya- **13**, (8), p 25
copaka- p 239
copana- p 239n
cora- **64**
corī- **64**, (133), p 26f, p 25, p 258
chatradhāra- **98**, (142)
chāyāgrāhī- p 168
janyà- (N) **4**, (142)
jánya- **4**, (175)
× _japitṛ-_ **61**, (317)
jara- s.v. _a_°; III
jaritṛ- s.v. _a_°
jarya- p 65, s.v. _a_°
× _jāyāghna-_ **115**, (90)
*_jārabhāra-_ p 118n

× *_jārabhārī-_ p 118, -n
jārya- s.v. _a_°
× _jighra-_ (independently) **92**, (161), p 27; III
jña- **88**, (38); III
× _takya-_ **4**, (298)
× _tatkarā-_ **120**, (226), p 135
× _tatkarī-_ **120**, (226), (375), [PS]
× _taddarśa-_ p 223n
E _tana-_ **95**, (206), p 24, p 135
× *_tākya-_ p 60
tāḍagha- (N) p 195
tādṛś- (?) **136**, (56), [PS]
tādṛśa- (?) **137**, **136**, (58), [PS]
tāna- **95**, (207)
× _tilaṁtuda-_ **125**, (233)
× _tundaparimārja-_ **108**, (218), p 27
C _tundaparimṛja-_ **83**, (200)
× _tomaragraha-_ (in agent sense) **67**, (190)
× _tomaragrāha-_ **67**, (190)
tyādṛś- (?) p 223
tyādṛśa- (?) p 223
dadhṛk- p 222n
E _dadhṛṣ-_ (N) **135**, (276), p 24, p 26f
× *_dabhya-_ **31**, (65)
× _darśanīyaṁmanya-_ p 208
× _dasyuhatyā-_ **15**, (169), p 25, p 27 [PS]
E _dābhya-_ **31**, (17); s.v. _a_°
dārvāghāṭa- **111**, (220), p 24, p 27
× *_dārvāghāta-_ p 27, p 186
× _digdhasahaśaya-_ **74**, (197)
× _ditsya-_ **13**, (302)
diva- p 133f
E _duroṇasad-_ **138**, (74), p 27
durga- **130**, (123), p 24
durgama- p 211n
deva- (?) **79**, (135), p 24, p 26f
devayajyā- (N) p 90n
drughaṇa-/°na- p 104
dvārapāla- **98**, (143)
dvipa- **82**, (354)
dviṣ- p 32
E _dhanurgraha-_ (in agent sense) **67**, (193); III
dhanurgrāha- **67**, (193), p 121n
dhara- p 169n
dharmavāha- p 168
× _dhitsya-_ **13**, (303)
× _nakhamuca-_ **84**, (355)
× _nakhamucā-_ p 143
× *_nakhamoca-_ p 144
× *_nakhamocā-_ p 144
× _nagarakāra-_ **103**, (146)
× _nagaraghāta-_ **147**, (341), p 194, p 195n
× *_nagaraghna-_ p 236
× _nagnaṁkaraṇā-_ **133**, (263)
× _nagnaṁkaraṇī-_ **133**, (263)
× _nagnaṁbhaviṣṇu-_ **134**, (52); _a_° s.v.
nada- **64**
nadī- **64**, (33), p 24, p 27
nandana- p 116n
nartaka- **57**, **96**, (99), (111)
nartakī- **57**, **96**, (105), (114), (117)
nartikā- **57**, **96**, (102)
C _nāḍiṁdhama-_ **126**, (45)
× _nāḍiṁdhaya-_ **126**, (332)
× _nāsikaṁdhama-_ **126**, (43)
× _nāsikaṁdhaya-_ **126**, (331)
× _nikāyya-_ (N) **35**, (97), p 67
niceya- **12**, (95), p 25, p 87
nimiṣa- p 133
nimeṣa- p 133
× _nirga-_ **130**, (243)
× *_nilipa-_ p 151
nilimpa- **93**, (275), p 24, p 27f, p 155
nilimpaka- p 150
paktavya- **3**, (2)
paktṛ- **61**, (30)
paca- **63**, (32), p 116n, p 168; _a_° s.v.; III
C _pacelima-_ **1**, (249); III
× _pañcālacara-_ **118**, (330)
× *_pañcālacāra-_ **110**, (73)
C _paṇḍitaṁmanya-_ p 208,-n
patighnī- **115**, (91); _a_° s.v.
× _padasaṁghāṭa-_ **112**, (257)
× _padasaṁghāta-_ (?) (in agent sense) **112**, (166); III
pannaga- **130**, (241)
paricarya- p 64n
parivrājaka- **60**, (29)
parivrājikā- p 114
C _palitaṁkaraṇa-_ **133**, p 219
× _palitaṁkaraṇā-_ **133**, (262)
× _palitaṁkaraṇī-_ **133**, (262)
× _palitaṁbhaviṣṇu-_ **134**, (51); _a_° s.v.
× _pavya-_ **10**, (7), p 25, p 83
pācaka- **56**, (27), p 25
pāṇigha- (N) p 195
× _pāṇisargya-_ **28**, (177)
pādapa- p 24, p 139
× _pāyya-_ (N) **35**, (96), p 67, p 87n, p 258
× _pārśvaśaya-_ **73**, (155), p 25
× _pāvya-_ **32**, (19), p 25, p 85n
× _piṇḍakara-_ (in agent sense) **121**, (150), p 199n, p 200n
pṛḍa- (Free ?) p 67, p 99,-n
× _pṛṣṭhaśaya-_ **73**, (156)
E _pratigṛhya-_ **26**, (268)

pratigrāhya- **26**, (268), p 27, p 96
× *pratyāsāriṇī-* **141**, (339)
× *pravaka-* **97**, (209), p 113
× *pravādya-* **42**, (124)
× *prahuva- p 214-216
prahva- **132**, (337), p 24
× *prāvaka- **59**, **97**, (182), p 25, p 27
priyaṁvada- p 209
× *priyaṁkaraṇā-* **133**, (265)
× *priyaṁkaraṇī-* **133**, (265)
× *priyaṁbhaviṣṇu-* **134**, (54); *a*° s.v.
plavaka- p 164
phalegrahi- (N) p 202,-n
× *bahukarā-* **120**, (227), p 135
× *bahukarī-* **120**, (227), (376), [PS]
budha- **80**, (280), p 25
× *brahmajiya- p 214-216
E *brahmajya-* **132**, (267), p 24
brahmavādin- **143**, (247), p 24f, p 27
brahmavādinī- p 259
E *bhadravinda-* **94**, (323), p 153
bhava- **66**, (34), p 24, p 26; III
bhavya- (N) p 58n, p 100,-n
bhāravāha- **98**, (145)
bhārahāra- **98**, (144)
× *bhārāhāra-* p 166n
E *bhārya-* **44**, (181), p 24, p 27, p 94n
bhāryā- **45**, (22), p 95n, p 108n
× *bhikṣācara-* **119**, (372) [PS]
× *bhikṣācāra- **110**, (71), p 198
× *bhida-* **80**, (281), p 25; III
C *bhidelima-* **1**, (250)
bhṛtya- p 42, p 93, p 108
bhṛtyā- p 94, p 95n, p 108n
bhettavya- **3**, (3)
× *bhojin-* (independently) **145**, (77)
× *madhuveda- p 152
× *manoghra- p 150n
× *mahākumbhakāra-* **104**, (69), p 29
māṁsabhakṣa- p 155
× *māṁsabhakṣā-* **100**, (214)
× *māṁsakāmī* **100**, (213)
māṁsabhakṣs- p 155
× *māṁsabhakṣā-* **100**, (214)
× *māṁsabhakṣī-* **100**, (214)
māṁsaśīla- p 155
× *māṁsaśīlā-* **100**, (212)
× *māṁsaśīlī-* **100**, (212)
× *mitaṁgama-* **128**, (259)
mitaṁgamā- p 208
E *mitravinda-* **94**, (323), p 153
mitravindā- p 153
C *miṣa-* p 133f
× *muṣṭiṁdhama-* **126**, (235)
C *muṣṭiṁdhaya-* **126**, (46)
× *mūlavibhuja-* **84**, (202)
mūlavibhujā- p 143
× *mūlavibhoja- p 144
× *mūlavibhojī- p 144
mṛḍa- (Free ?) p 99n
× *mṛtkumbhīkāra- p 181
meghasthāyin- p 234
meya- **12**, (94), p 25, p 87
meṣa- (?) **79**, (134), p. 24, p 26f
× *yatkarā-* **120**, (225), p 135
× *yatkarī-* **120**, (225), (374), [PS]
× *yatya-* **4**, (286)
× *yaṣṭigraha-* **67**, (189)
× *yaṣṭigrāha-* **67**, (189)
yājaka- **56**, (28), p 25
× *yātya- p 59f
yādṛś- (?) p 223
yādṛśa- (?) p 223
× *yudha-* **80**, (282), p 25
rajaka- p 44, p 160f
rajakī- p 160f
rajikā- p 160f
rañjaka- **57**, **96**, (101), (113)
rañjakī- **57**, **96**, (107), (116), (119)
rañjikā- **57**, **96**, (104)
rantṛ- **61**, (31)
C *rājagha-* (N) **117**, (223)
C *rucya-* (N) **22**, (153)
× *lapya- **30**, (64)
lava- p 173n
× *lavaka-* **97**, (211), p 113
lavakā-, °*kī-* p 258
× *lavitavya-* **3**, (4)
× *lavya-* **10**, (6), p 83, p 85n
× *lāṅgalagraha-* **67**, (187)
× *lāṅgalagrāha-* **67**, (187)
lāpya- **30**, (16), p 24
× *lāva- p 173n, p 175n, p 182
lāvaka- **59**, **97**, (184), p 25, p 27
× *lāvya-* **32**, (18), p 25, p 85n
× *lipa- p 27, p 151
L *limpa-* **93**, (140); III
× *vaḍavāsaṁdāya-* **99**, (366)
E *vatsavinda-* **94**, (323), p 153
vadha- p 61n, p 62n
vadhya- (?) **5**, (172), p 24, p 91
× *varṇasaṁghāṭa-* **112**, (256)
× *varṇasaṁghāta-* (?) (in agent sense) **112**, (165); III
vaḍavāsaṁda- p 209
vasitavya- p 55
vasuvinda- **94**, (323), p 153
vastavya- p 24, p 55
× *vāka- (v.l.) p 113, p 157
× *vākī- (v.l.) p 157

× *vātamaja-* **125**, (231)
C *vāyaka-* (v.l.) **58**, **96**, (313), (324), p 29
vāyakī- (v.l.) **58**, **96**, (315), (326)
vāyikā- (v.l.) **58**, **96**, (314), (325)
E *vārya-* **43**, (126), p 27, p 72n
vāstavya- (?) **2**, **(171)**; III **(Also,** *vatthavva-* at end.)
vikṣipa- **86**, (137), p 35, p 133n; *a*° s.v.
× *vikṣepaka-* **56**, (311), p 35
vikṣeptṛ- **61**, (131), p 35
vighana- p 104
× *vijighra-* **92**, (162), p 27
vinda- **94**, (39)
vindu- (N) p 152n
vibudha- p 136
C *vilikha-* **86**, (138), p 133n; *a*° s.v.
× *_vilipa-_ p 27, p 151
vilimpa- p 150f
× *_vilekhaka-_ **56**, (312)
× *_vilekhitṛ-_ **61**, (318)
vihaga- **130**, (239)
vihaṁga- **129**, (238)
vihaṁgama- **129**, (237)
× *vṛtya-* **18**, (10), p 92
× *vedādhyāya-* **98**, **53**, (141)
E *vediṣad-* **138**, (75), p 27
vyathya- p 76; *a*° s.v.
vyāghra- **92**, (110), p 24
vyāghrī- p 149
× *vyājighra-* **92**, (163), p 27
E *vrajyā-* **54**, (87), (284)
× *śaṁvada-* **70**, (351)
× *śaṁstha-* **85**, (358), p 25
× *śaṁsthā-* **139**, (371)
C *śakṛtkari-* **123**, (229)
× *śakṛtkāra-* **123**, (229), p 27
× *śaktigraha-* **67**, (186), p 25
× *śaktigrāha-* **67**, (186), p 183
× *śaṁkarā-* **72**, (297), p 76n, p 200n
C *_śaṁkarī-_ **122**, (167), p 27, p 126
× *śaṁgarā-* **72**, (297)
śatrughāta- p 185
śatruha- p 185
× *śamanīpāra-* **98**, **53**, (328)
E *śaṁbhava-* **71**, (253), p 24
× *śayitṛ-* **61**, (132), p 25
× *śardhaṁjaha-* **125**, (234)
śarva- **66**, (35), p 24, p 26
× *śalabhottha-* **81**, (321)
śava- (v.l.) p 29, p 119n
śaśaghna- p 195
C *śaśaghnī-* **116**, (148)
× *śasya-* **4**, (299)
śasyā- p 60n
× *śāyaka-* **55**, (128), p 111n
× *_śāsya-_ p 60
× *śuniṁdhaya-* **125**, (232)
C *śokāpanuda-* **83**, (201)
× *śokāpanoda-* **108**, (219), p 27
× *śyenottha-* **81**, (320), p 83n, p 167n, p 172n
× *śrāddhakara-* **121**, (149), p 200n
× *_śrāddhabhojin-_ **146**, (78), p 29
śvapāka- p 118n
śvapākī- p 118n
*_śvapāca-_ p 118n
× *śvahatyā-* **15**, (168), p 25, p 27, [PS]
saṁvatsarasthāyin- p 234
saṁsarga- p 82
saṁsargya- p 82
saṁcarya- p 64n
× *saṁcāyya-* (N) p 88
sadṛś- (?) **136**, (55), [PS]
sadṛśa- (?) **137**, **136**, (57), [PS]
samajana- p 109
E *samajyā-* **54**, (89), (310), p 24
× *samavasargya-* **27**, (270)
E *samavasṛjya-* **27**, **29**, (270), p 24
samastha- p 139
E *samūhya-* (N) **37**, (20)
× *_saṁda-_ p 25; III; p 258
E *saṁbhārya-* **21**, (14), p 24, p 27, p 94n, p 95
E *saṁbhṛtya-* **21**, (13), p 25, p 94n
× *saraka-* **97**, (210), p 113
sarasiruha- p 144; III
C *sarasīruha-* **84**, (357); III
sarasīruhā- p 143
sarvatraga- **130**, (240)
sarvavinda- **94**, (323), p 153
sava- (v.l.) p 29, p 119n
sādhukārin- **142**, (62)
× *sādhudāyin-* **142**, (340)
C *sāraka-* **59**, **97**, (183), p 25, p 27
L *siva-* **80**, (283), p 25, p 133
× *_sīdhupā-_ p 147
× *sīdhupī-* **113**, (121)
sukhapratīkṣa- p 29, p 83n, p 137n p 155, p 167n
× *sukhapratīkṣā-* **100**, (216), (367)
× *sukhapratīkṣī-* **100**, (216), (367)
suga- **130**, (122), p 24
sugama- p 211n
× *sugla-* **87**, (359), p 25
C *subhagaṁkaraṇa-* **133**, p 219
× *subhagaṁkaraṇā-* **133**, (277)
subhagaṁkaraṇī- **133**, (277), p 24, p 222n

× *subhagaṁbhaviṣṇu-* **134**, (49); a° s.v.
× *sumla-* **87**, (360), p 25
surāpa- p 190
× *surāpā-* **90**, (114), p 27
surāpī- **113**, **114**, (120)
× *sūtragraha-* **68**, (194), p 25, p 183
× *sūtragrāha-* **109**, **68**, (164), p 27
sūrya- (?) (N) **22**, (81), p 24
sṛjya- **27**, (15), p 25, p 81
× *seva-* **79**, (136), p 26f, p 136
stanaṁdhaya- **126**, (44)
C *stambakari-* **123**, (228); III
× *stambakāra-* **123**, (228), p 27
× **stambarama-* **69**, (251)
C *stamberama-* **69**, (195)
stāvya- p 71, p 85n
stutya- **16**, (80), p 85n
× *stryagāraga-* **131**, (290)
sthaṇḍilaśāyin- **144**, (152)
× *sthaṇḍilasthāyin-* **144**, p 232-234
sthāyin- **144**, p 232-234
× *sthūlaṁkaraṇā-* **133**, (261)
× *sthūlaṁkaraṇī-* **133**, (261)
× *sthūlaṁbhaviṣṇu-* **134**, (50); *a*° s.v.
hāraka- **56**, (26), p 25
× **himavacchrāva-* **98**, (68)
hiraṇyapṛḍa- p 99n
× **hvāka-* p 113, p 157-159
× **hvākī-* p 157-159
× *hvāyaka-* **58**, **96**, (313), (324)
× *hvāyakī-* **58**, **96**, (315), (326)
× *hvāyikā-* **58**, **96**, (314), (325)

Ardhamagadhi :
vatthavva- (?) (// Sk. *vāstavya-* above) p 257

Asokan :
aya- (// Sk. *arya-* above) p 258

(B) Form Groups

°*a*(*c*)- forms **62**, (185)
Karmopapada + *cāra-* forms **110**, (71)
°(*k*)*elima*(*r*)- forms **1**, (174)
°*ga-* forms **131**, (293)
°(*ṇ*)*in*(*i*)- forms **142**, (246)
Tṛjādyanta forms **53**, **55**, (278), (279)
°*pā-* names **91**, (255)
°*pī-* names **114**, (258)
Praiṣa Kṛtya-s **52**, (85)
non-Praiṣa Kṛtya-s **52**, (86)
°*manya-* forms **127**, (47), (151), p 29
°*vinda-* names **94**, (323)
°*saṁghāṭa-* forms **112**, (222)
°*saṁghāta-* forms p 187n
Subanta + *ṁ* + *gama-* forms **128**, (236)
Subanta + *sad*(ādi) + (kvip)- forms **138**, (59)
Subanta + *stha-* forms **81**, (109), (199)
°*stha-* forms **85**, (37), p 25
°*hátyā-* forms **15**, (79), p 24

III

INDEX TO FORMS

NOT USED AS FREE OR SOPAPADA KRDANTA-S

- Reference to a form generally points to the page where it occurs (hence, without the distinguishing letter 'p' attached before the number), or/and to a footnote on that page (with 'n' added immediately or after a hyphen).

- Rarely, reference is made to the Observation or to the position of the form within the linguistic evolution : here the same devices (of bold type and round brackets) have been used as in the earlier Index.

- Symbols like ×, E, (N), (IRR) and (?) also have the same denotation as in the earlier Index.

- The Kṛdanta element (as also one which is doubted to be such elsewhere with a '?') from the complex formations is pointed out by putting it within round brackets.

× akiṁcit(kurvāṇa)- (IRR) 102n
a(gamyā)gamana- 69
× agādhād(utṛṣṭa)- (IRR) 102n
agāra- 214
a(jara)=amara- 132
anapuṁsaka- 101, -n
(andhaṁbhaviṣṇu)tā- 220
anna(ada-,adā-) 176f
anya- 223, 224, -n
anyā(dṛś)- (?) 24, 223n, (244)
anyā(dṛśa)- (?) 24, 223n, (245)
(amāvasya)ka- 97n
(amāvāsya)ka- 97n
× amāṣaṁ(haramāṇa)- (IRR) 102n
ambho('bhigama)- 174
*ambho('bhigamā)- 173n, **101**, (296)
ara- 153
*artha(jña)- **99**
(arthajña)praśaṁsā- 147
avamūrdha-, °ka- 129
avaśyam- 84,-n, 85,-n
avaśya(=anuṣṭheya)tva- 85
avaśya(yātavya)tā- 85
aśva(=avatāna)- 155
asivadha- 61, 62, -n
× asi(vadhya)- 61f, **5**, (344)
asūrya- 238
ākhu- 138
āḍhya- 115
ātmambhari)tā-, °tva- 202
āma- 228
(amāvasya- >)
āmāvasya- 97n
(amāvāsya- >)
āmāvāsya- 97n
āvaśyaka- 83-85
āścarya- (N) 63, -n
udara- 127f
uras- 211f
uṣṭra- 167
odana- 170
*odana(paca)- **99**
kaccha- 44, 140
kaṭāha- 140
kamaṇḍalu- 167
kalyāṇa- 172n
kāka- 144
kukṣi- 25
*kāṇḍalāva- 173n
kāṣṭha- 170
*kāṣṭha(bhida)- **99**
kukṣī- 25
kuḍya- 170
*kuḍya(limpa)- **99**
kuṇḍa- 89n
(kupya)bhūyiṣṭha- 77
kumuda- (?) **84**, (158)
(kumuda)śyenī- 144
× *ku(moda, modā)- 144
kula('ṭā)- 139n
kūpa(khānaka)- **113**, **161**
kṣīra- 147

khalebusam 104
(khānaka)bhaya- 113
khārī- 206
.. gaṅgā(dhara)- 169n
gala- 239
× gale(copaka)- **150**, (343)
giriśa- (?) 24, 130f, **77**, (173)
giriśa- **130f**
gopendra- 152n
E go(vindu)- 44, 152n
gaurutalpika- 213
grāma- 25
× grāma(gamin)- 165n
grāmanayanasya 182n
grāma(vāstavya)- 56
ghaṭa- 180n
ghaṭī- 180n
× ghana(ghātya)- **52**, (348)
cakra(dhara)- 169n
cattā (?) 60n
carcā- 166f
carcāguṇa- 167
carcāpada- 167
cāru- 187, -n
copati 239n
chatra- 166, 168
jāra- 117
*jāra(bhara)- 117f
× jāra(bharā)- **65**, (349), 26f
(hvāyaka- >)
√jihvāyakīyiṣa- 161
(jña=)odana- 146
talpa- 214
tā(dṛś)- (?) 223n, **136**, (56)
tā(dṛśa)- (?) 223n, **137**, (58)
tila- 203
tilakālaka- 193f
tṛṇa- 25, 104
× tṛṇa(=upendhya)- **52**, (347), 25
tyā(dṛś)- (?) 223
tyā(dṛśa)- (?) 223
√dabh- 83n
dasyu- 25, 70, -n
dāru- 186
× digdhasaha- 128, -n
deva- (?) 24, **79**, (135)
dvāra- 166
(dhanurgraha)vara- 121
dhanus- 120
(nakha- 144
(nartakī- >)
nartakikā- 161
nartakitamā-, °rā- 161
nānānagara(vāstavya)- 56
nānāpuṣpa(bhava)- 119
(pacelima)tā- 54
× pada(saṁghāta)- (?) **112**, (166)
(padasaṁghāta)ja- 187
panna- 211n
palita- 218
pāṇi- 25, 81
pāṇirekhā- 194n
× pāṇilekhā- 193n
× *pāṇi(sṛjya)- **28**, (177), 25, 80
× pāda(hāraka)- **150**, (248)
pārśva- 25, 128
piṇḍa- 199
pratuda- 186
priya- 218
priya(kurucarā)- 197
bahu(kurucarā)- 197
busa- 104, -n
× busa(=upendhya)- **52**, (346)
busaplāvī- 104n
brāhmaṇa- 25
bhāra- 167
bhū(dhara)- 169n
mano(jighra)- 150n
maskara- 114
maskarin- 114
māṁsa- 172, -n
māṁsa(kāma)ka- 173n
māṁsa(bhakṣa)- 172n
mita- 209
musala- 62
musalavadha- (implied with asivadha- s.v.)
× musala(vadhya)- 61f, **5**, (345)
meṣa- (?) 24, **79**, (134)
yavabusa- 104
yā(dṛś)- (?) 223
yā(dṛśa)- (?) 223
vajra-(dhara)- 169n
vaḍavā- 170
*vaḍavā(saṁda)- **99**
vadha- 61n, 62n
vadhya- (?) 24, 61, **5**, (172)
vanavāsa(bhava)- 119
varṇa(saṁghāta)- (?) **112**, (165)
(varṇasaṁghāta)ja- 187
vahīnara- 127n
vāta- 203n
vāstavya- (?) 24, 55
vāstu- 55
viha- 209, 212n
vihāyas- 209, 212n
vihīnara- 127n
vihīnanara- 127n
vṛṣala- 194
vṛṣalī- 193f

vedi- 227
vaiśya- 25
vaihīnari- 127n
śakuni- 194
śakunikā- 125n
śakti- 25, 120
śam- 25, 123, -n, 145
śamanī- 166
śaśa- 195
śyena- 138
śrāddha- 199
śrī(dhara)- 169n
× *śva(ghātya)-* **40**, (170), 25, 104n
śvan- 25, 70, -n, 91, 104n
śva(paca)- 118, -n
śva(pacā)- **65**, (350), 26f
sa(dṛś)- (?) 223n, **136**, (55)
sa(dṛśa)- (?) 223n, **137**, (52)
samajana- 109
samāna- 223, 224, -n
saras- 144
(sarasiruha)janman- 144
sarasī- 143n
(sarasīruha=)īkṣaṇa- 144
(sarasīruha)bandhu- 144
× **sarasī(roha, rohā)-* 144
sarvatra- 212
sādhu- 231
sukha- 172
sukha(ghātya)- 91
sūtra- 121
sūtra(grāhaka)- 121
sūrya- (?) (N) **22**, (81)
(stambakari)tā- 202
sthāṇḍila- 233
srag(dhara)- 169n
svāmin- 25, 258
himavat- 167
hiraṇye- 98, -n
(hvāyaka- >)
√*hvāyakīya-* 161

IV

INDEX TO BOUND KṚDANTA-S

- The list notes Kṛdanta forms that occur in the final position within an Upapada-Samāsa (which is observed to be a Nitya-Samāsa or an obligatory compound: vide Sūtra 2.2.19).
- These bound forms, after the colon (:) mark, are followed by a record of the Upapada-s (as they are technically determined by Sūtra 3.1.92) with which they are found in (invariable) construction.
- (1) Bound forms with **Upapada-s individually specified** are shown in the roman type for the whole entry;

  (2) while those with **Upapada-s illustrating a class** are shown in the italic type for the whole entry.
- Classes of Upapada-s noted are: K(arman), S(ubanta), Kartṛ, Adhikaraṇa and Upasarga (— all in the roman type).
- Upapada-s recorded by Ptj as expansions of the Gaṇa-s from Kty's Vārttika-s are treated as specific ones.
- Specific Upapada-s, not found recorded by the Munitraya but detected only later, are added with a semi-colon (;) followed by the plus (+) sign.
- (1) The final of an Upapada is generally shown with the Sandhi where it takes place; it is shown without it only where the following bound Kṛdanta begins with a vowel.

  (2) The initial of a bound Kṛdanta is shown without the Sandhi, even where it is expected to occur with the final of the (preceding) Upapada; in the latter situation, however, the modifiable Kṛdanta-initial is indicated with a capital letter.
- Hypothecated compound-forms (indicated with a star) are also included in the list.
- Explanation of the bracketed symbols (?, N, IRR, v.l.) is the same as earlier.

aja- : vāta-m
ajya- : ā
ajyā- : sam
ad- : K(*āma*)
ad- : kravya
adhy-āya- : veda
apa-nuda- : śoka
apa-noda- : K(*śoka*)
ā-ghāṭa- : cāru, dāru
ā-ghāta- (agent sense) : cāru
ā-cārā-, ā-cārī- : K(*kalyāṇa*)
āda- : K(*anna, kravya*)
ādī- : K(*anna*)
ikṣā- : K(*sukha*) + *prati*
ikṣī- : K(*sukha*) + *prati*
ūhya- : sam (N)
kara- : K(*piṇḍa, śrāddha*)
karaṇa- : andha-ṁ, āḍhya-ṁ, palita-ṁ, subhaga-ṁ
karaṇā- } : andha-ṁ, āḍhya-ṁ, nagna-ṁ,
karaṇī- } palita-ṁ, priya-ṁ, subhaga-ṁ, sthūla-ṁ
karā- : kiṁ, tat, bahu, yat, śaṁ
kari- : śakṛt, stamba
karī- : kiṁ, tat, bahu, yat, *śaṁ

kāmā-, kāmī- : K(_māṁsa_)
kāyya- : ni (N)
kāra- : K(_kāśa-kaṭī, kumbha, *kumbhī, nagara, mahā-kumbha, *mṛt-kumbhī, śakṛt, stamba_)
kārin- : sādhu
kṣamā-, kṣamī- : K(_kalyāṇa_)
ga- : ura, dur, nir, panna, viha, viha-ṁ, sarvatra, su
_ga-_ : K(_gurutalpa, grāma, stryagāra_)
gama- : dur, viha-ṁ, su
gama-, gamā- : S(_mita-ṁ_)
garā- : śaṁ
gāma- : K(_*grāma_)
gāmī- : K(_ambho_) + _'bhi_
guha-, guhā- : kāka
gṛhya- : api, prati
goha-, gohā- : *kāka
graha- : aṅkuśa, ghaṭa, ghaṭī, tomara, dhanur, yaṣṭi, lāṅgala, śakti, sūtra
grahi- : phale (N)
grāha- : K(_aṅkuśa, kamaṇḍalu, ghaṭa, ghaṭī, tomara, dhanur, yaṣṭi, lāṅgala, śakti, sūtra_)
grāhī- : K(_chāyā_)
gla- : Upasarga (_su_)
gha- : tāḍa (N), pāṇi (N), rāja (N)
ghaṇa- : dru
ghana- : ayo, dru, vi
ghāta- (agent sense) : K(_amitra, nagara, śatru_)
ghātin- : kumāra
ghna- : jāyā
ghna- : K(_*nagara_)
ghnī- : pati
ghnī- : K(_śaśa_)
ghra- : K(_*mano_)
ghra-, ghrī- : Upasarga(_vy-ā_)
cara- : bhikṣā
cara- : Adhikaraṇa(_kuru, pañcāla_)
carī- : Adhikaraṇa (_kuru_)
carya- : ā, ā-ś(?)(N);+ anu, upa, pari, saṁ
cāyya- : upa (N), saṁ (N)
cāra- : K(_*kuru, *pañcāla, *bhikṣā_)
citya/ā : agni (N)
japa- : karṇa, karṇe
jarya- : a (N)
jaha- : śardha-ṁ
jighra- : Upasarga (_vi, vy-ā_)
jiya- : K(_*brahma_)
jña- (?) : K(_artha_)
jya- : K(_brahma_)
tuda- : tila-ṁ
_da-_ : K(_go_)
darśa- : K(_*āditya, tad_)
dāya- : K(_*go_)
dāyin- : S(_sādhu_)
dṛś- (?) : S(_anyā, tā, tyā, yā, sa_)
dṛśa- (?) : S(_anyā, tā, tyā, yā, sa_)
dhama- : khari-ṁ (v.l.), khāri-ṁ, muṣṭiṁ śunilṁ stana-ṁ muṣṭi-ṁ
dhaya- : khari-ṁ (v.l.), khāri-ṁ, ghaṭi-ṁ, nāḍi-ṁ, nāsika-ṁ, muṣṭi-ṁ, śuni-ṁ, stana-ṁ
dhāra- : K(_chatra_)
nāya- : K(_grāma_)
Nāya- : K(_uṣṭra_) + _pra_, K(_grāma_)
nāyya- : ā (N)
_Nī-_ : K(_grāma_)
_pa-_ : S(_kaccha, kaṭāha, dvi, pāda_)
_pa-_ : K(_kṣīra, surā_)
pacya- : _kṛṣṭa_ (N)
pari-mārja- : K(_tunda_)
pari-mṛja- : tunda
paśya- : a-sūrya-ṁ (IRR)
_pā-_ : K(_kṣīra, *sīdhu, surā_)
pāka-, pākī- : K(_śva_)
pāca- : K(_odana, *śva_)
pāyya- : kuṇḍa (N)
pāra- : carcā, śamanī
pāla- : K(_dvāra_)
pāvya- : avaśya
_pī-_ : S(_kaccha_)
pī- : sīdhu, surā
pṛḍa- (?) : upacāyya (N)
bhakṣā-, bhakṣī- : K(_māṁsa_)
bhari- : ātma-ṁ (N), kukṣi-ṁ
bhava- : śam
bhaviṣṇu- : (Kartṛ:—) a-nagna-ṁ, an-andha-ṁ, an-āḍhya-ṁ, andha-ṁ, a-palita-ṁ, a-priya-ṁ, a-subhaga-ṁ, a-sthūla-ṁ, āḍhya-ṁ, *āḍhyī, nagna-ṁ, palita-ṁ, priya-ṁ, subhaga-ṁ, sthūla-ṁ
bhāra-, bhārī- : K(_*jāra_)
bhāvya- : avaśya
bheda- : K(_kāṣṭha_)
bhojin- : S(_a-śrāddha_ : IRR, _*śrāddha_)
manya- : S(_darśanīya-ṁ, paṇḍita-ṁ_)
mucā-, mucā- : nakha
muda- (?) : ku
moca-, mocā- : *nakha
mla- : Upasarga(_su_)
yajyā- : deva (N)
rama- : *stamba, stambe
ruha- : sarasi, sarasī

ruhā- : sarasī
lāva- : K(_kāṇḍa_)
lāvya- : avaśya
lipa- : Upasarga(_*ni_, _*vi_)
limpa- : ni; + vi
lepa- : K(_kuḍya_)
vada- : priya-ṁ, vaśa-ṁ, śaṁ
vasya/ā- : amā (N)
vādin-, vādinī- : brahma
vāsya/ā- : amā (N)
vāha- : K(_dharma_, _bhāra_)
vinda- : ara, go; + anu, kuru, cāru, bhadra, mitra, vatsa, vasu, sarva
vindā- : mitra
vi-bhuja/ā- : mūla
vi-bhoja/ī- : K(_*mūla_)
veda- : K(_*go_, _*madhu_)
vyathya- : a (N)
śa- (?) : giri
_śa-_ (?) : K(_giri_)
śaya- : Adhikaraṇa (_giri_)
śaya- : (Kartṛ:—) avamūrdha, uttāna
śaya- : udara, digdha-saha, pārśva, pṛṣṭha
śāyin- : S(_sthaṇḍila_)
śīlā-, _śīlī-_ : K(_māṁsa_)
Śrāva- : K(_*himavac_)
saṁ-ghāṭa- : *karma
saṁ-ghāṭa- : K(_pada_, _varṇa_)
saṁ-ghāta- (agent sense) : *karma
saṁ-ghāta- (agent sense(: K(_pada_, _varṇa_)
sad- : S(_duroṇa_)
Sad- : S(_vedi_)
śīlā-, _śīlī-_ : K(_māṁsa_)
sargya- : pāṇi, sam-ava
sāriṇī- : S(_ud-ā_, _praty-ā_)
stāvya- : *avaśya
stutya- : avaśya
stha- : S(_āsana_, _śaṁ_, _sama_)
(_S_)_tha-_ : S(_ākhu_, _śalabha_, _śyena_) + _ut_
sthā- : S(_śaṁ_)
sthāyin- : S(_giri_, _megha_, _saṁvatsara_, _sthaṇḍila_)
_ha-_ : K(_śatru_)
hatyā- : S(_dasyu_, _śva_)
hāra- : K(_bhāra_, _bhāra-ā_)
hārī- : K(_kṣīra_)

V

INDEX TO ROOTS

WITH CORRESPONDING FREE AND BOUND KṚDANTA-S

(• For facility in printing, the root-sign is omitted.)

(A) Roots with Free Kṛdanta-s

*añj- : *ajya-*
aṭ- : aṭā-
ad- : ada-, adā-
adhi-i- : adhyāyaka-
anu-bhū : anubhavya-
anu-sthā- : anuṣṭheya-
apa-vad- : apavādya-
api-grah- : apigrāhya-
abhi-gam- : abhigama-
ā-car- : ācārya-
ā-nī- : āneya-
ās- : āsaka-, āsitṛ-
ā-sthā- : āsthāyin-
ā-han- : āghāta-
*ā-hve- : *āhuva-, āhū-, āhva-*
ut-sṛj- : utsṛṣṭa-
un-miṣ- : unmiṣa-
upa-indh- : upeddha-, upendhya-
upa-ci- : upaceya-
ṛ- : arya-, ārya-
kām- : kāma-
kup- : kupya-, kopya-
kṛ- : kāraka-, kurvāṇa-
khan- : khanaka-, khanakī, khānaka-, khānakī, khānikā-, kheya-
gam- : gamin-, gamya-, gamyā-
gup- : kupya-, gopya-
gai- : geya-
grah- : grāhaka-, grāhin-
*ghrā- : *ghrāya-*
*cat- : catya-, *cātya-*
car- : carya-, cārya-
ci- : citya-, cetavya-, ceya-
cup- : copaka-, copana-
cur- : cora-, corī
jan- : janya-
jap- : japitṛ-
jṝ- : jara-, jaritṛ-, jārya-
jñā- : jña-
*tak- : takya-, *tākya-*
tan- : tana-, tāna-
*dabh- : *dabhya-, dābhya-*
dā- : ditsya-
div- : diva-, deva- (?)
dṛś- : dṛś-, dṛśa-
dviṣ- : dviṣ-
dhā- : dhitsya-
dhṛ- : dadhṛṣ-, dhara-
nad- : nada-, nadī-
ni-ci- : niceya-
ni-miṣ- : nimiṣa-, nimeṣa-
nṛt- : nartaka-, nartakī-, nartikā-
pac- : paktavya-, paktṛ-, paca-, pacā-, pacelima-, pācaka-
pū- : pavya-, pāvya-
pṛḍ- : pṛḍa- (?)
prati-grah- : pratigrāhya-
pra-vad- : pravādya-
pra-hvṛ- (?) *: prahva-*
*pra-hve- : *prahuva-, prahva-*
*pru- : pravaka-, *prāvaka-*
plu- : plavaka-
budh- : budha-
bhakṣ- : bhakṣā-
bhid- : bhida-, bhidelima-, bhettavya-
*bhuj- : *bhojin-*
bhū- : bhava-, bhavya-
bhṛ- : bhara-, bharā-, bhārya-, bhāryā-, bhṛtya-, bhṛtyā-
mā- : pāyya-, meya-
miṣ- : miṣa-, meṣa-
*muc- : *moca-, *mocā-*
*mud- : *moda-, *modā-*
mṛḍ- : mṛḍa- (?)
yaj- : ijyā-, yājaka-
*yat- : yatya-, * yātya-*
yā- : yātavya-
yudh- : yudha-
rañj- : rajaka-, rajakī, rajikā-, rañjaka-, rañjakī-, rañjikā-

ram- : _rantṛ-_
ruc- : _rucya-_
ruh- : _*roha-, *rohā-_
lap- : _*lapya-, lāpya-_
limp- : _limpa-, *limpa-_
_lū-_ : _lava-, lavaka-, lavitavya-, lavya-, *lāva-, lāvya-_
vadh- : _vadha-, vadhya-_
vas- : _vasitavya-, vastavya-, vāstavya-_ (?)
vi-kṣip- : _vikṣipa-, vikṣepaka-, vikṣeptṛ-_
vind- : _vinda-_
vi-budh- : _vibudha-_
vi-likh- : _vilikha-, *vilekhaka-, *vilekhitṛ-_
vi-limp- : _*vilipa-, vilimpa-_
_vṛ-_ : _vārya-, vṛtya-_
_ve-_ : _*vāka-, *vākī-, vāyaka-, vāyakī, vāyikā-_
śaṁs- : _śasyā-_
śarv- : _śarva-_
śas- : _śasya-, *sāsya-_
_śī-_ : _śayitṛ-, śāyaka-_
saṁ-han- : _saṁghāta-_
saṁ-dā- : _*saṁda-_
siv- : _siva-_
_sū-_ : _sūrya-_ (?)
_sṛ-_ : _saraka-, sāraka-, sūrya-_ (?)
sṛj- : _sṛjya-_
sev- : _seva-_
stu- : _stāvya-, stutya-_
sthā- : _sthāyin-_
han- : _ghana-, ghātya-, vadhya-_
_hṛ-_ : _haramāṇa-, hāraka-_
hve- : _*hvāka-, *hvākī-, hvāyaka-, hvāyakī-, hvāyikā-_

(B) Roots with Bound Kṛdanta-s

_aj-_ : _ajā, ajyā-_
añj- : _ajya-_
_ad-_ : _ad-, āda-, ādī-_
adhi-i- : _adhyāya-_
apa-nud- : _apanuda-, apanoda-_
ā-car- : _ācārā-, ācārī-_
ā-han- : _āghāṭa-, āghāta-_
īkṣ- : _īkṣā-, īkṣī-_
ut-(s)thā- : _uttha-_
_ūh-_ (?) : _ūhya-_
kām- : _kāmā-, kāmī-_
_kṛ-_ : _kara-, karaṇa-, karaṇā-, kari-, karī-, kāra-, kārin-_
kṣam- : _kṣamā-, kṣamī-_
gam- : _ga-, gama-, gāma-, gāmī-, (ṁ-)gama-, (ṁ-)gamā-_
guh- : _guha-, guhā, *goha-, *gohā-_
_gṝ-_ : _garā-_
grah- : _gṛhya-, graha-, grahi-, grāha-, grāhī-_
glai- : _gla-_
ghrā- : _ghra-, ghrī-, jighra-_
car- : _cara-, carī-, carya-, *cāra-_
_ci-_ : _kāyya-, cāyya-, citya-, cityā-_
jap- : _japa-_
_jṝ-_ : _jarya-_
jñā- : _jña-_
jyā- : _*jiya-, jya-_
tud- : _tuda-_
_dā-_ : _da-, *dāya-, dāyin-_
dṛś- : _darśa-, dṛś-, dṛśa-, (ṁ-)paśya-_
dhṛ- : _dhāra-_
dhe- : _(ṁ-)dhaya-_
dhmā- : _(ṁ-)dhama-_
_nī-_ : _nāya-, nāyya-_
pac- : _pacya-, pāka-, pākī, pāca-_
pari-mṛj- : _parimārja-, parimṛja-_
_pā-_ : _pa-, pā-, pāyya-, pī-_
pāl- : _pāla-_
_pū-_ : _pāvya-_
pṛḍ- : _pṛḍa-_ (?)
_pṝ-_ : _pāra-_
bhakṣ- : _bhakṣā-, bhakṣī-_
bhid- : _bheda-_
bhuj- : _bhojin-_
bhū- : _bhava-, (ṁ-)bhaviṣṇu-, bhāvya-_
bhṛ- : _(ṁ-)bhari-, bhāra-, bhārī_
man- : _(ṁ-)manya-_
muc- : _muca-, mucā-, *moca-, *mocā-_
mud- : _muda-_ (?)
mlai- : _mla-_
yaj- : _yajyā-_
ram- : _rama-_
ruh- : _ruha-, ruhā-_
limp- : _*lipa-, limpa-, lepa-_
_lū-_ : _lāva-, lāvya-_
vad- : _(ṁ-)vada-, vada-, vādin-, vādinī-_
vas- : _vasya-, vasyā-, vāsya-, vāsyā-_
vah- : _ūhya-_(?), _vāha-_
vind- : _vinda-, vindā-, *veda-_

vibhuj- : *vibhuja-*, *vibhujā-*, **vibhoja-*, **vibhojā-*
vyath- : *vyathya-*
śī- : *śa-*(?), *śaya-*, *śāyin-*
śil- : *śilā-*, *śilī-*
śo- (?) : *śa-*
śru- : **śrāva-*
saṁ-han- : *saṁghāṭa-*, *saṁghāta-*
sad- : *sad-*
saṁ-dā- : *saṁdāya-*
sṛ- : *sāriṇī-*, *sūrya-* (?)
sṛj- : *sargya-*
stu- : *stāvya-*, *stutya-*
sthā- : *stha-*, *sthā-*, *sthāyin-*
han- : *gha-*, *ghaṇa-*, *ghana-*, *ghāta-*, *ghātin-*, *ghna-*, *ghnī-*, (*ṁ-*)*jaha-*, *ha-*, *hatyā-*
hṛ- : *hāra-*, *hārī-*

VI

INDEX TO DERIVATIONS, LEXICAL NOTES AND TECHNICAL TERMS

- References are given to page-numbers and (with 'fn' preceding) to footnote-numbers.
- 'S' stands for 'Sūtra'.

(A) Derivations

ācārya- fn 209, 92
ājya- 73, fn 160
āhū- fn 536
giriśa- fn 319, 131, fn 322
govinda- fn 363
deva- 133f, fn 326, fn 327
prahva- fn 534
meṣa- 133, fn 324
vihaga- fn 528
vaihīnari- fn 308
vyāghra- 148f, fn 353a
śaṁkarā- 126f
samūhya- (S) 89
sūrya- (S) fn 171

(B) Lexical Notes

agamyā- 68f
atisarga- (S) fn 247
adhikaraṇa (Vt) fn 526
amanuṣya- (S) fn 464
aravinda- 153
avatāna- 154, fn 372
asurya- fn 587
asūrya- (S) fn 587
ācarya- 63
ācārya- 92
upacāyyapṛḍa- (S) 99
upaceyapṛḍa- 66, 99
kupya- (S) 77
kumbhī- fn 428
gandha- fn 423
gamya- 68
gamyā- 68f
ghana- (S) 104f
√*cat-* fn 128
carcā- 167
cārvāghāta- 187, fn 449
√*cup-* fn 595
√*jan-* fn 123
jāti- 230
√*tak-* fn 127
tāḍa- fn 471
tāḍagha- (S) 195
tāla- fn 471
dadhṛṣ- (S) fn 543
dārvāghāṭa- fn 443, fn 444
√*dṛś-* 223
deva- fn 326, fn 327
deśa- (Vt) fn 46, fn 526
nāḍiṁdhama- fn 505
nilimpa- fn 359, fn 360, fn 361
pacelima- 54
parivrājaka- 114
pāyya- fn 198
piṇḍakara- fn 478
prahva- fn 534
prāptakāla(tā)- (S) fn 247
praiṣa- (S) fn 247
busa- 104
busaplāvī- fn 256
bhava- 119
√*bhuj-* fn 342
meṣa- 133, fn 324
lakṣaṇa- (S) 192, 193, fn 462
vārya- 93
vyāghra- 148f
vrajyā- 109, fn 270
śakunikā- fn 302
śaṁkarī- fn 304
śasyā- fn 129
śilpa- fn 378 (*śilpin-* 156, 195)
saṁbhakti- 93
sarasī- fn 344

(C) Technical Terms

Anabhidhāna 35, fn 105, 100, 155, fn 393a, fn 400, 216, 235
anādeśe svārthavijñānam fn 330
anukta-samuccaya fn 112, fn 501
antarbhāvita-ṇyartha fn 489

apakarṣa 151(?), fn 566
Apūrva vidhi 101
abhidhāna 35
aviṣeṣa 103, fn 353, fn 513, fn 537, fn 538
avyayakṛt fn 100, fn 104
avyutpanna 32, 134
Asamartha-samāsa 101, fn 241, 234, 237, fn 582, 238, fn 586
iṣṭa 9, 234, 235
Iṣṭaśabda-s 10
iṣṭa-siddhi 11, fn 571
Iṣṭi 9
Uṇādi-s 31
Upadeśa 35, 37
Upapada (technical or etymological) 36, fn 227, fn 231, fn 423
Upapada-samāsa 36
upasarjana fn 474
elima (*kelimar*) 28, 40, 44, fn 113
kṛt 33, fn 102
kṛtya 33, fn 97
kṛtya-pradeśa fn 265
Kṛdanta (See under : 'Grammar' from VIII.)
kṛdyogā ṣaṣṭhī fn 399
gamaka(*tva*) fn 245
ghañartha fn 328, extended : fn 346
'Chandas' fn 457, fn 459, 257
jātāv ekavacanam fn 437
Jñāpaka(°na) fn 158, 101, fn 244, 102, fn 248, fn 408, 173, fn 410, 184, fn 511, 216
taṇ (from *taṇi*) fn 456
Tatsādhukāritā (s.v. Sādhukāritā)
tavya 40
Tācchīlika (—a variety of Rūḍhi-śabda) fn 355
Tācchīlya
  //Samabhihāra : 163
  (//Abhyāsa : fn 378)
  vs (Tat-)Sādhukāritā : 163, fn 385
  >Sādhukāritā 163, fn 384
tādarthye caturthī fn 340
Tṛjādi-s 33, fn 99, fn 261
tyadādi-gaṇa (composition of) 224
Nitya-samāsa fn 108, fn 328, 145, 170
Nipātana 26, 65, 77, fn 227, fn 545, 222
nirvartyamāna karman 166, fn 387
pacādi-gaṇa (composition of) 116-20, 134, fn 400-(a)
Pada-vidhi fn 423
Padasaṁskāra-pakṣa fn 398, fn 400-(d)
para-balīyastva 35
parama-prakṛta fn 225
para-rūpa ekādeśa fn 332
Paryudāsa 101, fn 240
pūrva-vipatiṣedha fn 130, fn 155, fn 491
prakṛtārthe ṇijanta (root) fn 410-(i), fn 437
Pratyaya-vidhi fn 423
Prayojana 174, fn 460
Prasajya-pratiṣedha 101, fn 240
Prātipadika 32
Prāpti 9
prāpya karman 165f, fn 387
Bāhulya (See under 'Interpretation-Processes' from VIII.)
Bhāva
  —*kṛdabhihita* or *dravyavat* or *siddhāvastha* or *bāhya-* fn 103, fn 104, 109
  —*tiṅabhihita* or *kriyāvat* or *sādhyāvastha* or *ābhyantara* fn 104
bhāvādhikāra fn 266
Bhāṣā 4, 5, fn 202, fn 317, fn 318, fn 422, 257
madhye'pavāda-nyāya 152
'mahā-saṁjñā' fn 423
Yoga-rūḍha fn 215, fn 295(,125)
Yoga-vibāga 138, 141
Rūḍhiśabda-s fn 57 (= fn 118), 31, fn 87a (= fn 547), fn 87b, fn 355
la 33, fn 96
lasārvadhātuka-svara fn 511, fn 513
liṅgaviśiṣṭa-paribhāṣā fn 286
Vākyabheda —with P : fn 493,
  —with Kty : fn 389, fn 403
Vākyasaṁskāra-pakṣa fn 397, fn 400-(b)
Vā'sarūpa-paribhāṣā 35, fn 556
vikriyamāṇa karman 166, fn 387
Vipratiṣedha fn 395
vṛt fn 370
Vyatyaya 176, (variety of :) fn 413
Vyākhyāna 16f, fn 72b, 134
Śabdānusāna 30
Śilpa
  < Abhyāsa fn 378
  s.v. Sādhukāritā 163
Śiṣṭa (or Ārya) 7, 8, fn 37
Śiṣṭa-prayoga 175, 181
Saṁkhyātānudeśa 204, fn 498
Saṁjñā fn 215, fn 220-(4), fn 423
Saṁjñāśabda-s 31
  —a variety of Rūḍhiśabda-s 31
satiśiṣṭa-vikaraṇa-svara fn 511, fn 513

Samabhihāra
// Tācchīlya 163
(// Abhyāsa fn 378)
vs (Tat-) Sādhukāritā 163, fn 385
> Sādhukāritā (,Kauśala, Śilpa)
163, fn 384
Sādhukāritā
// Śilpa 163
(// Kauśala fn 384)
vs Samabhihāra 163, fn 385
< Samabhihāra 163, fn 384
sāpekṣa (*pada*) fn 423, 179f
Sāmarthya 178(,101, fn 242)
Sāhacarya 258
Sthānivadbhāva fn 130

VII

INDEX TO NAMES OF MODERN SCHOLARS

- References are given to page-numbers.
- A bracketed reference indicates a reference within a reference.

Abhyankar, KV 42^2
Allen, WS 32
Apte, VS 109
Aufrecht, T 160
Balasubramanyam, MD 64, 97, 218
Belvalkar, SK 8, 11
Benfey 4
Birwé, R 61, 84, 104, 114, 144, 153, 186, 193, 224
Bhandarkar, RG 5, 6, 7, 12
Bhattacharya, RS 33, 35
Bhattacharya, Vidhushekhara 5
Böhtlingk, O 204, 238
——— and Roth, R 152
Bühler, G 101
Burrow, T 5, 22, 89
Cardona, G 31, 101, 167
Chaitanya, Krishna 9
Chakravarti, SC 6
Chaturvedi, SP 11
Dasgupta, SN 13^2, 20, 161
De, SK 54
Devasthali, GV 12, 14, 31, 65, 195
Edgerton, F 104
Emeneau, MB 22
Faddegon, B 36
Firth, JR (10)
Franke 4
Ghatage, AM 5, 7^2, 11
Ghosh, A 191
Goldstücker, T 124
Gonda, J 21, 23^2, 149
Grassmann, H 43, 217
Griffith, RTH 150
Haug, M 80
Hazra, RC 80
Ivanov, VV and Toprov, VN 32
Iyer, KA Subramania 130, 187
Iyer, S Venkitasubramonia 89
Joshi, SD 33, 102
——— and Roodbergen, JAF 11, 13, 16, 18^2, 35, 53
Kangle, RP 199
Kashikar, CG 101
Katre, SM 9^2, 30
Keith, AB 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 104, 150
Kielhorn, F 4, 7, 11^2, 16, 17, 35, 42^2, 70, 78, 86^2, 109, 125, 127, 179, 180^2, 181, 182, 184, 202, 206, 207, 212, 215, 233
Kuiper, FBJ 22
Laddu, SD 7, 11, 23, 33, 53, 107, 222, 258
Liebich, B 4, 139
Limaye, VP 140, 152, 166, 170, 176, 206, 208, 215, 232, 238
Loman, JRA 257
Macdonell, AA 6, 32, 40, 93, 188
Manavalli, G 130
Mayrhofer, M 104, 149
McDavid, Raven I 7
Mehendale, MA 139, 258
Mimamsaka, Y 160
Mishra, Vedapati 107
Mitra, RL 181, 213
Modak, BR 140
Nandargikar, GR 54, 130
Nath, Narendra Chandra 32
Pade, JS 31
Palsule, GB 93, 104
Pandit, MD 32
Pandit, SP 92
Pathak, KB 6, 9, 124
Paranavitana, S 54
Phadke, Babashastri 150
Raghunātha Śāstrī 203
Raja, C Kunhan 10
Raja, K Kunjunni 15, 16, 206
Ram Gopal 104
Rapson, EJ 4
Renou, L 6, 16, 17 23^2 40, 91, 129, 191, 202, 257, 258
Robins, RH 9
Roth, R and Böhtlingk, O 152
Rocher, Rosane 14, 18, 19
Roodbergen, JAF and Joshi, SD 11, 13, 16, 18^2, 35, 53
Sarangi, Alekha Chandra 35

SARMA, KMK 11, 14, 204, 205
SARUP, L 109
SCHOKKER, GH 257
SCHROEDER, V 99
SEN, Sukumar 7, 17, 23, 258
SHARMA, Mahesh Dutt 60
SKÖLD, H 139
SÖRENSEN 153
STAAL, JF 23
TARAPOREWALA, IJS 5, 13
TEDESCO, P 63, 104
THIEME, P 3, 6, 15, 16, 36^{2}, 79, 98^{2}, 99^{2}, 99^{2}, 124^{2}, 139, 228, 229
THOMAS, FW 7, 202
TOPOROV, VN and IVANOV, VV 32
TURNER, RL 104
URDANG, Laurence 21
VASU, SC 133
VAIDYA, PL 104
VIDYALANKAR, Jayapala 257
WEBB, Clement CJ (65)
WEBER, A 7, (,124)
WHITNEY, WD 4^{4}, (4), 6, 7, 11, 20, 99, 134
WILSON, HH 187
WINTERNITZ, M 131
WRIGHT, JC 17
VENKATACHARYA, T 206
ZVELEBIL, Kamil 22

VIII

SUBJECT INDEX

- References are given to page-numbers and (with 'fn' preceding) to footnote-numbers.
- 'CC' stands for 'Commentaries' or 'Commentators.'

(A)

GRAMMAR
INTERPRETATION
LINGUISTICS

LITERATURE, ANCIENT (INDIAN)
SOCIETY
TEXT-STUDY

Grammar

ACCENTS
  comparative powerfulness of : fn 511, fn 513
ADVERB
  being an object : fn 425, fn 448, fn 521
COMPOUNDING
  foremost condition for : 101, 178, 179, 237
  tendency growing to violate it, discouraged by Ptj : 102, 238
  not possible with expectant or dependent form : 179, fn 426
  possible with it in some fields : fn 427
  tendency to use some Bahuvrīhi-s, discouraged by Ptj : 174
  Paribhāṣā on — with a Kṛdanta : 36, fn 107
  'Compound-root' : 37, 169, fn 396
CVI-PRATYAYA
  condition for using : 179, fn 426
  compounding not possible with a Cvyanta : 179, fn 426
  compounding possible with some Cvyanta-s : fn 427
DERIVATION
  principles underlying : 31 [See also 'Rūḍhiśabda-s' under VI-(C).]
  zero-suffix in : 32, fn 91a, fn 91b, fn 91c
  process of primary formation : 32f
  analytical and synthetical methods in : 32f, fn 93
  devoicing suggested in : fn 172, 126
  syncopation suggested in : fn 308
  analogical extension of false (?) etymology : fn 363
  attempts at — connected with attempts at knowing meaning : 140
  folk-etymology : fn 353a
  misunderstanding of KIELHORN : fn 528
GENDER
  puzzling use by Ptj : fn 364
GENITIVE
  objective, subjective : 207
GRAMMARS, ANCIENT, OF SANSKRIT
  objective estimation of : 4
KṚDANTA-S
  division of : 33
  forces of : 33f, fn 119
  depeedce on usage of : 34f
  alternative usage of — with dissimilar suffixes : 35
  rules for compounding of : 35-37
  Paribhāṣā on compounding with : 36, fn 107
LOCATIVE
  senses of : 36, 71, 83, 84, fn 231
OBJECT-TYPES : 166, fn 387

Interpretation

CONDITION (=CONTEXT)
  a guarantee of meaning : fn 49
  stress (?) on : 25, 27
  stress (?) on more than one : 26, 28
  uncertain reference within : 25
  correspondence of — with usage, complete or incomplete : 21

  of appositional construction : 132

COMMENTARIES
  high value of — on *M* : 16
  no full reliance upon : 16, fn 72
  lack of historical sense in : fn 454, fn 498
  intelligent suggestion of existence of other schools of thought, made in : 97, fn 230
  resort to diversity-rule by : fn 160, fn 220
  interpretation of Sūtra-s:— fn 463, fn 533, fn 541
  of the pl. : fn112
  of *ca* : fn 501
  of *sanumka-nirdeśa* : fn 358
  of *samabhihāra* : 163, fn 383, fn 384
  of Sāhacarya : fn 158, 258
  interpretation of Vārttika-s :—fn 533
    on Vākya-bheda : fn 389, fn 403
  not taking note of a Kārikā : fn 282

GRAMMARIANS OF ANCIENT INDIA
  their avowed principle of social usage : 9
  their open mind to new developments : 11, fn 59
  their role as objective and faithful recorders of contemporary usage : 4, 60
  challenging position from WHITNEY against that : 4
  unjust denial to — of what is accepted in principle : 18
  mostly innocent of historical concept : 19
  interpretation-inclined : 19
  their intelligent reconciliation of objective recording of facts and giving a stable rule : 12
  theoretical value alone to their records ? : 60, 217, 221
  "grammarians' dialect"
  theoretical formations suggested : 23, 29, 178f, 214f, 234, 235
  theoretical establishment of forms less powerful than actual usage : 9, fn 37

INTERPRETATION
  need felt when P's rule is unclear 14
  as extending scope of P's rules : 11
  means of securing *iṣṭa-siddhi* : 11, fn 57 (=fn 118)
  devices of — enumerated : fn 56
  aspects discussed in : 15
  service rendered by : 15
  honest one, basically helpful : 14, 15
  strained one, not objective : 14, 15
  variety of — of the same text ! : fn 65
  categories of : 15
  risk of combining a good principle with bad implementation : 15
  position of total reliance upon—, improper : 17, 14
  not always 'real' : 18
  can be suppressing linguistic development : 18
  upshot of incidental results of : 138
  genesis of — with P : 17
  weight of authoritativeness increasing with closeness to source : 16f, fn 72a
  Yathottara-validity maxim with the Munitraya :—
    (1) unacceptable as providing interpretation fully faithful to P : 17, fn 72a
    (2) acceptable if interpreted as showing stages in linguistic history : 13
  tests to know objectivity of : 19
  check provided on — by attestation : 20

INTERPRETATION-PROCESSES
  with *Yoga--vibhāga* (by Kty:) 138, 141
  of *ca* : (by AUTHOR:) 65, 151, fn 403, (by CC:) fn 501
  of pl.: (by LIMAYE:) fn 417, (by AUTHOR:) fn 310, (by CC:) fn 112
  of first person : (by CC:) 97, fn 230
  of Locative: (by Kty:) 83, 84, 71
  of conjugational class: (by Kty, Ptj, CC:) fn 454, (by Kty:) 72
  of use of a word : (by Kty:) 184f (=197), 217, 228, (by Ptj:) fn 147
  of re-employment of a word (*punarvidhāna*) : (by Kty:) fn 155 125, fn 299, 230
  of import of a word: (by Ptj:) 101f, 193, fn 462, (by CC:) fn 244
  of form of suffix: (by Śl-Vt:) 220f
  of *Sāhacarya* : (by CC:) fn 158, 258
  of *sanumka-nirdeśa*: (by CC:) fn 358
  of *samabhihāra*: (by CC:) 163, fn 383f
  of *Vākya-bheda*: (by CC:) fn 389, fn 403, (by AUTHOR:) fn 493
  of *Bāhulya* ("Diversity") :—31, 34, fn 160, fn 209, fn 413, 233, 236, 239

proper degree of : fn 126
for securing wanted results : fn 571
not noted by P in names : 192
taking away specification : 454, fn 592, fn 597
extension of—not much illustrated by Ptj : 240

INTERPRETATION OF THE MUNITRAYA-STATEMENTS

Of Pāṇini :—

By Kty —
doubtful : 125, fn 299
not acceptable : 72, 85, 95, fn 220
rational : fn 547, 228f, fn 556
of Locative : 83, 84, 71
of use of a word : 184f (=197), 217, 228
of *punarvidhāna* : 125, fn 299
of conjugational class : 72, fn 454
Before Ptj —
of form of a suffix : 220f
of *bahulam* : fn 120
By Ptj —
overdrawn : 101f, 193, fn 462, fn 547
convincing : fn 155
of use of a word : fn 147
of import of a word : 101f, 193, fn 462
of *punarvidhāna* : fn 155, 230, fn 558
By later CC —
of *Sāhacarya* : fn 158, 258
of pl. : fn 112
of *ca* : fn 501
of *sanumka-nideśa* : fn 358
of *samabhihāra* : fn 383, fn 384
of *bahulam* : fn 571, fn 592, fn 597
of conjugational class : fn 454
By THIEME —
fn 557
By AUTHOR —
of *Vākya-bheda* : fn 493
of *sanumka-nirdeśa* : fn 358
of import of a word : 193

Of Kātyāyana :—

Before Ptj —
149, 215
By Ptj —
doubtful : 18(, 71, fn 191)
broadening interpretation by Kty (interpreting P) : fn 513
broadening or generalising implication of Vt : 174
general : fn 46, 215
By later CC —
of Vākya-bheda : fn 389, fn 403
of restriction to Veda : fn 317
general : 154f, fn 383, fn 384, 215, fn 533
By THIEME —
fn 557
By V. P. LIMAYE —
of pl : fn 417
By AUTHOR —
of *Vākya-bheda* : fn 403
of pl. : fn 310
of *ca* : 65, 151
of import of a word : fn 323, fn 450a
general : 62, 74, 94, fn 219, 176

Of Author of a Śloka-Vārttika :—

By later CC —
of first person : 97, fn 230

Of Patañjali :—

By later CC —
215, fn 533
By KIELHORN —
fn 429, fn 431
By THIEME —
fn 231, fn 232, fn 234
By AUTHOR —
of his choice of examples : 200, fn 479
general : 174, fn 430, fn 529

Linguistics

LANGUAGE (OF SPEECH)
being *nitya* or conventional : 8, fn 35
inherent vitality of : 5, 9
basis : conventions set up by *Loka* or cultured society (Śiṣṭa-s) : 8
part of social process : 9, 10
smallest recurring meaningful units of : 32

LINGUISTIC BORROWING

22, fn 81a, fn 203a, fn 353a
LINGUISTIC DIFFUSION
(or REGIONAL CONTEXT OF SPEECH)
9, fn 84
for P : fn 83a, (fn 113), 124, fn 297, 130
for Kty : fn 33, fn 47-(b), 107, 124, 134f, 137, 165, 167
for Pre-Ptj stage : 97, fn 344, 175, 221
for Ptj : fn 33, fn 47-(b), 127, fn 344
for Yāska : fn 47-(b)

'Focal area' of speech : fn 24
'Focal area' for Sanskrit : 7
shifting of the same : 8
LINGUISTIC EVOLUTION
presuppositions for hope to discover : 3
time ripe for study of : 3, 4
assumption of — not easy : 13
difficulties in assuming : 13
rejection of a study of — on theoretical grounds, not happy : 18
special effort needed to explore : 19
growth of ungrammatical tendencies discouraged by Ptj : 102, 174, 238
inextricable mixing with regional factor : 22, 137, 248
discreteness in : 23, fn 143, 65
LINGUISTIC PHENOMENA
analogical extension : fn 363
devoicing : fn 172, 126
l-alternation : 164
morphological confusion : 126
phonetic confusion : 126
LINGUISTIC SCIENCE
guiding role of : 8, fn 36
not to impose language upon people : 8
interest in stability of usage : 8
superior to Padapāṭha-kāra or to Application of science : 73, fn 163
creative stage in Sanskrit for : 8
PRAKRITISING TENDENCIES
fn 11, fn 12, 7, fn 25a, fn 202, fn 363
SPOKEN NATURE OF SANSKRIT
evidence for times of P, Kty, Ptj : 4-8, fn 21, fn 22
influencing rules of grammar : 5, 101f, 9
popular dialects : (*See under* Prakritsing Tendencies)
TESTS
for value of Interpretation : 19
for value of Implied (or Counter-) Usage : 22
USAGE
(*With ancient Indian grammarians* :)
fixation of—for fear of corruption : 7
interest in stability of : 8
one of cultured society (Śiṣṭa-s) more powerful (*iṣṭa*) : 9, fn 37
avowed principle of grammarians : 9
searching comparison of grammar with recorded usage : 4
(*Discovering of* :)
extensive data-collection needed for : 9, 21
restricted spheres of—over literature, time, region : 9
no surety of—due to incomplete documentation : 21
value of connected—supplied : 28
anticipation of : 20, fn 281, 142, fn 363, fn 400a, fn 502a, fn 514, 213, 233, fn 588a
enumeration possible only of exceptions : 167
(*Functioning of* :)
contextual function of : 10, fn 49
a guarantee of linguistic meaning : fn 49
correspondence with context, complete or incomplete : 21
sacrificial (with Vedic accent) vs secular (with accentual liberty) : 88f, fn 202, 258
being chief characteristic of Kṛt, Taddhita, Samāsa : 34f
(*Types of* :)
informal : 9, fn 202
formal : 9, 23
artificial (innovations) : 23 (*See also* "grammarians' dialect" *under* 'Grammarians')
from poetic license : 23, fn 84a
of socio-linguistic nature : 23, fn 84b
from ritual setting : 23, fn 84c
(*Analysis of* :)
opaque vs transparent (or unitary vs collective) : 31
principles of analysis (=derivation) of : 31
P's linguistic analysis : 32
currency of alternative Kṛdanta —with dissimilar suffixes : 35, fn 556
USAGE, IMPLIED
(or COUNTER-USAGE)
intended by author or not : 21
possible in complete correlation between Usage and Condition(=Context) : 21
tests for : 22
intended or not by P : 25f, 27
intended or not by Kty : 27, 28, 133, 136, 151, 152, fn 481
not always supplied by Ptj : 27, 28
USAGE, NOT DERIVABLE BY P
possibilities of looking at : 12, 20, fn 85, 23-25
leading to modifications of

P's rule : 10
leading to adjustment within
P's rule : 10

Literature, Ancient (Indian)

General:—

NATURE

limitations due to current state of knowledge : 21
incomplete documentation : 21
uncertain chronology : 22
lack of critical texts : 22

ATTESTATION

being an effective check or test on value of Interpretation : 19, 20
being a test on value of Implied Usage : 22
difficulties in way of : 21f
Non ∼ (or lack of evidence), helpful : 20; but no proof for absence of usage : 21

LOSS OF

13, 20, 21, fn 80
making allowance for : 21
idea ridiculed by WHITNEY : 20, fn 79
suspicion true of : 21f

LINGUISTIC RESEARCH OF

element of chance in : 21

WRITERS OF

inaptiude for historical recording : 13
respectfulness to standard texts : 13
loyalty deeply ingrained : fn 64

Particular:—

CHRONOLOGY

Atharvaveda-Pariśiṣṭa : fn 333
Bhāgavata-Purāṇa : 80
Cāritravardhana : fn 319
Gonardīya : fn 181
Jānakīharaṇa : fn 115
Kauśika-Sūtra : 104, 110
Kuṇaravāḍava : fn 307
Puṇyarāja : fn 319
Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa : fn 296
Ślokavārttika-kāra : fn 195, fn 542
Vājasaneyi-Saṁhitā : 124, fn 296, fn 297, fn 321
Yaśastilaka-Campū : 54

METRICAL

line (?) : 202
shortening (?) : 131

QUOTATIONS

not fully traced : fn 128 (Veda), 93 (Veda); fn 465 (*Mahābhārata*); fn 120, 113, fn 292, 134, fn 487, fn 504, fn 525, fn 576
traced by THIEME : fn 181 (Veda)

Society

Power of linguistic convention set up by : 8, 9, 10, 31
this changing with age and locality : 13
this change comparable with rule by democracy : fn 63
Material condition
changes in—reflected in Usage : 99
Law Code : 68f, fn 148, fn 149
Modes of Vedic Recitation : 166
Sacrificial practices
changes in : 99
one term in—unattested in Veda : 88

Text-Study

CRITICAL APPARATUS

For *Mahābhāṣya*:—
29, 82, fn 178, 113, fn 284, fn 300, fn 301, fn 314, 157, fn 439, fn 502, 233, fn 570
For P's *Dhātu-Pāṭha*:—
fn 127
For *Chāndogya-Brāhamaṇa*:—
66

TEXT OF RULE

General:—

sanctity of : 10
modification in : 10
serious tampering with — not permitted : 10, fn 50 (= fn 220-(1), fn 467), 195
interpretation of : 10, fn 51, fn 65
Hindu loyalty to the standard : 13, fn 64
fixation of — good for student and for society : 11
being only shell or exterior : 18

For *Pāṇini*:—

lack of accented — for P : fn 124
tampered with by *KV* : fn 180, fn 184
on P's 3.1.109 : fn 153
P's 3.2.30 being not spurious : 204, fn 490, fn 491

(B)

On the Munitraya

(Supplementing the Observations at Pages 23-29)

PĀṆINI

BASIS OF WORK
- Sanskrit living with : 4f
- main source of his work : 5
- 'Bhāṣā' of : 4, 5, 257
- utilising Veda : 5, 257

MANNER OF RECORDING
- power of observation : 6, 12
- negligence : 6, 12
- oversight or forgetfulness : 6, 12, 18
- not deriving forms : 20f, fn 332
- not noting Diversity in names : 192
- use of un-Pāṇinian expressions : 5

HIS TEXT
- want of accented text : fn 124
- serious tampering with — not permissible : 10, fn 50 (= fn 220-(1), fn 467), 195
- non-spuriousness of — at 3.2.30 : 204, fn 490, fn 491
- correct one at 3.1.109 : fn 153
- author's surmise on 3.4.68 showing separation of form-types : fn 124
- tampered with by *KV* : fn 180, fn 184

HIS TECHNIQUE
- work being Instruction on Words : 30
- his own oral gloss not preserved : fn 72, 17
- want of oral transmission of his instruction : 17
- device of Contiguity (*Sāhacarya*) : fn 158, 258
- device of Harmony (?) : fn 358
- attitude to (or principles of) derivation : 31f
- using Locative not for Upapada alone : 36, 83
- mentioning Upapada (1) technically, (2) etymologically, and (3) both-ways : 36, 83
- Diversity-rule : 34, fn 126, fn 220
- presupposing (?) a semantic transition : 94
- interpreted (not correctly) by Kty : 72, 85
- interpreted (not correctly) by Ptj : 101f, 193, fn 462
- interpreted by Author : fn 194, 193

GENERAL
- his knowledge of Law Codes, unknown : 69
- his distance from Kty : fn 32

KĀTYĀYANA

HISTORICAL POSITION
- Sanskrit living with : 5f
- product of times : 5
- distance from P : 6, fn 32
- nearness to Ptj : 7f, fn 32
- probably Southerner : 8, fn 33, 124
- strict Vedist : 89
- having *Padapāṭha* in mind : 176
- familiarity with Law Codes : 69, fn 149
- witness to Linguistic change : 5, fn 13

CRITICISM ON HIS WORK
- by Ptj, on a point : fn 164
- by Śabara : 6, fn 18
- by Nāgeśa, on a point : fn 421
- by **WHITNEY** : 6
- by THIEME : 6
- by AUTHOR, on a few points : fn 547, 228f, fn 556

HIS TECHNIQUE
- principle of Sūtra-reference, discovered by KIELHORN : fn 269
- reference to Pūrvapakṣin's views : 101, 167, (106), (111), 133, 135, 136, 137, 173
- himself using Anuvṛtti : 232
- over-cautiousness about Anuvṛtti : 73, fn 164, fn 166, 92
- mysterious non-prohibition of *anupasarge* in a Vt : 74
- proper re-placement of Vt-s : fn 442, 205, fn 446, 239, fn 590
- in two minds on (primary or secondary) derivation : 56, fn 119, 61, 130, fn 547
- extra-*it* suggestions : fn 119
- particular to mention *sopasarga* roots : fn 168
- style of supplying Negative

(= Counter-) examples : fn 323
a non-corrective note by : 151
use of economy : fn 527
INTERPRETATION OF HIS NOTES
a fair one : 62
doubt on Ptj's : 18(, 71, fn 191)
strong backing from Ptj : 162f
his *'na vā'* Vt-s : fn 264a
need of framing a Vt : fn 328
purpose of framing a separate Vt : fn 389, fn 403
on one Vt : fn 219
intention in a Vt : fn 395
intention ina Vt, unclear : fn 386
a Kṛtya form intended (?) : 74

PATAÑJALI

HISTORICAL POSITION
Sanskrit living with : 6-8, fn 21, fn 22
nearness to Kty : 7-8, fn 32
distance from Kty : 8
M-IA stamp on his name : 7
being different from Author of *Śloka-Vārttika* : 215
being different from Gonardīya : 181
drawing substance from Author of Śl-Vt : fn 196, fn 535, 258
treating *VDhSū* as Chandas : fn 457
familiarity with Law Books : 68, fn 148
References made to:—
anya vaiyākaraṇa-s : fn 337
'Apara' : 59f, 94, 95, fn 266, fn 528, 213
Kuṇaravāḍava : fn 172, 124, 126, 127, fn 307, fn 308, 199, 200
Gonardīya : 180f
Padapāṭha-kāra : 73, fn 163
Saunāga-s : 217f
LINGUISTIC LEAD TO SOCIETY
being highest authority : 7, fn 31
admonishing Padapāṭha-kāra : 73, fn 163
admonishing Kty : fn 164, fn 166
discouraging ungrammatical tendencies : 102, 174, 238
open mind to new developments : 11, 101f
MODE OF INTERPRETATION
strong backing to Kty : 162f
apparent difference with Author of Śl-Vt : 86, 258
comments on : 71, 73, fn 191, 101f
use of Locatives : fn 231
MANNER OF RECORDING
clarity : fn 479
a puzzling use of gender : fn 364
short recording : 100, fn 310, 191
his examples:—
from stock : cf. 177
choice : fn 479
manner of citing : 143
supply of Negative (or Counter) ones (with *'iha mā bhūt'*), providing useful linguistic data : cf. 72, 92, 107, 157, 163, 172

(C)

Author's Comments, Doubts and Suggestions

ON TECHNIQUE
By Pāṇini:—
suggestion of 'compound-root' : 37, 169, fn 396
suggesting separation of form-types at 3.4.68 (?) : fn 124
uncertain no. of *Nipātana*-factors : 77, fn 545
composition of *pacādi-gaṇa* : 119f, 134
composition of *tyadādi-gaṇa* : 224
subconscious use of zero-suffix : 32
By Kātyāyana:—
correction in Vt-texts suggested :
(3.1.112.4 :) fn 169,
(3.2.5.2 :) fn 340
mysterious non-prohibition of *Anuvṛtti* (at 3.1.109) : 73
reason for preference of the term *tṛjādi* to *ṇvulādi* : fn 261
purpose of framing a separate Vt : fn 403
having *Padapāṭha* in mind : 176
proper re-placement of Vt-s :
(2.1.33.2 :) 239, fn 590;
(3.2.29.2 :) 205, fn 496;
(3.2.49.1-3 :) fn 442
himself using *Anuvṛtti* : 232

By Padapāṭha-kāra:—
  strange resolutions : fn 418
By Patañjali:—
  need of prohibition of Anuvṛtti
    (at 3.1.109): 73
  choice of clear examples : fn 479
ON USAGE
With Munitraya:—
  missing some Vedic forms : fn 138
With Pāṇini (?):—
  doubt on *Dhātu-Pāṭha* meaning fn 159
With Kātyāyana:—
  form suspected to be in mind : 74
With Patañjali:—
  incomplete record : 54, 100,
    fn 310, 191
  sacrificial terms current in secular
    speech uttered freely (but same,
    strictly with Vedic accent, during
    sacrifice): fn 85, 88f, fn 202, 258
  basis suggested for temptation at one
    ungrammatical contemporary usage:
    fn 411
  strange use of gender : fn 364
  intended substantive suggested : 230
ON INTERPRETATION
Of Pāṇini:—
  uncertain no. of *Nipātana*-factors :
    77, fn 545
  of *ca* : 65, 151, fn 403
  of *Vākya-bheda* : fn 493
  evident presence of *Saṁkhyātānudeśa*
    at 3.2.29f : 204, fn 493
  principle of Harmony (?) : fn 358
  of import of a word : 193
  of reference within a term : fn 194
  of governing sense in a term : 232
Of Kātyāyana:—
  form suspected to be in mind : 74
  of import of words :
    (3.1.135.1:) fn 323;
    (3.2.49.3:) fn 450a
  general :
    (3.1.97.2, 3:) 62;
    (3.1.112.2:) 94, fn 219
    (3.2.15.4:) fn 322
Of Patañjali:—
  broadening the implication of Kty :
    174
  import of a text (II.76.13f): fn 430
  doubt on interpretation of a
    Vt(3.1.125.3): 71, fn 191
OF COMMENTATORS :
  on views on 3.2.29f : fn 498
  on *Yathottara*-validity maxim
  with the Munitraya:—
    (1) *unacceptable* as providing
      interpretation fully faithful to
      P : 17, fn 72a
    (2) *acceptable* if interpreted as
      showing stages in linguistic
      history : 13
ON SOME RECENT STATEMENTS
  WHITNEY :
    a printing mistage (?): fn 235
  KIELHORN :
    wrong interpretation : fn 528
  RENOU :
    oversight (?) : fn 484
    printing mistake (?) : fn 314, 258
    slip : fn 209
  THIEME :
    doubtful interpretation : fn 231,
      fn 234, fn 555

IX

ERRATA

- Within the *Reference* column, the page-number noted first is, after a dot, followed
  (1) by the line-number on that page; or
  (2) after 'fn', by the footnote-number, which again is followed by a dot and the line-number within it.
- *Symbols* used are :
  '>' for 'to be changed to'. '*fr. bel.*' for 'from below', and '*col*' for 'column'.
- *Direction words* are given in italics.
- Mistakes of English spelling are omitted.

5.6 used > use
10.27 better > better to
14.29 of > on
15.12 to to > to
16.7 *read as*: "(Tradition of)
23. fn 84 *read the numbers as* :
1, 48, 53, (55), 71, 72, 79, 80, 98, 101, 134
23. fn 84c, 2 *add, before reference*: *JA*
26. *point* 9 *read as*: Ākṛti
26. *point* 10 *read as*: Anuvṛtti
27.6 *read as*: *dārvāghāṭa-*
27. *point* 8 *have* * before
ghrāya- and *dārvāghāta-*
32.9 *read as*: Processes of Primary
33. fn 102.2 *read as*: 3.1.76
35.11 form > from
32.8. *col* 1 3.2.9-15 >
(*col* 1:) (*col* 2:)
3.2.9, 13-15 3.2.10-12
32.19 *read as*: i_1 (*in*)
32.20 37 > 37*
32.26. *col* 1 3.2.59*>
3.2.58, 59*
32.38. *col* 1 3.2.78 >
(*col* 1:) 3.2.78, 80, 83
(*col* 2:) *add* 3.2.79, 81, 82
39.6 223 > 2.24
40.23 *read as*: *ya*$_3$
45.13 *read as*: *Āśvalāyana*
46.11 *virata* > *vaivarta*
47.18 *read as*: *Kirātārjunīya*
48.21 *read as*: *Praśnopaniṣad*
49.34 *read as*: *Brāhmaṇa*
49.35 *read as*: ĀNANDACHANDRA

53.8 *read as*: participial
55.16 form > from
56. fn 119.7 that that > that
59. *last line* *read as*: *śasya-*
59. fn 126.8 *read as*: *kāryam*
60. fn 126.3 *read as*: *varṣeṇa*
61. fn 130.2 *read as*: Sthānivadbhāva
62.8 from > form
62. fn 134 *read as*: *taddhitenā...*
63.5 form > from
65.22 *read as*: *a-jarya-*
65.23 ased > used
67.9 enjoyed > enjoined
67. last line these > those
68. fn 147.3 *read as*: *prayojanam*
72.4 form > from
72.21 from > form
73. fn 164.2 *read as*: *anvākhyeyam*
74.1 *read as*: *ājya-* derived
from √*añj-*
74.23 from > form
75.27 from > form
77.12 *read as*: *katva* in √*gup-*
being derived
77.25 the > be
81.5 *pāni* > *pāṇi*
81.7 *r* > *ṛ*
83.5 **dābhya-* > **dabhya-*
84.7 *on 'Kty,' read fn. no. as*: 189
84.20 *read as*: *or āvaśyake*
85.20 *read as*: *avaśyayātavya-tā-*
85.24 from > form
85. fn 191.2, 10 *read as*: *-vipratiṣedha*
87.9 *nicya-* > *niceya-*

87.26	*kuṇḍā* > *kuṇḍa*
87. fn 199.2	***sminn*** > ***smin***
88.3	*-ṇayāt* > *-ṇapāt*
88.22	327 > 127
96.12	the the > the
97.20	*read as*: usage *amāvasyā-*
97. fn 227.1	*read as*: *gatikārako-*
98.6	*read fn. no. as*: **232**
99. fn 235.2	*read as*: *igupadha. . . .*
100.8	68 > 67
101.23	At another place, however, > Thus, (though only as a strong Pūrvapn case),
101. fn. 244.3	*read as*: *-pratiṣedhe*
103.12	*read as*: *-kāleṣu*
104.8	*omit*: as the Upapada
104. fn 250.2	*omit* the Upapada
109.21	*read as*: *vrajyā*
110.6	*read as*: *kṛṣṇā*
112.4 *fr. bel.*	*nartika-* > *nartikā-*
113.	*See fn.-matter, on* p. 114.
115.18	*japiiā* > *japitā*
116.6	*read on √pac- fn. no.*: 277
117.14	*read as*: *-Pariśiṣṭa*
118.8	*omit*: (Karmopapada)
118. fn 282.21	*read as*: *nyaṅkvādi*
118. fn 282.24	*read as*: *Kārikā*
120. fn 286.3	*khaṭi* > *ghaṭī*
121.3	*omit*: *
121.11	*read fn. no. as*: 288
122.4	any > and
122.27	from > form
126.13	woman > women
126.21	*read fn. no. as*: 306
127.27	*read as*: *pārśvābhyām*
127. fn 308	and from > and not from
128.19	what > want
128. fn 309.3	*read as*: *prāyogikī*
131.2	be to be > to be
132.13	*jṛ* > *jṝ*
133. fn 323.4	some > same
134.9	*pacadi* > *pacādi*
135.5	*kārā* > *karā*
136.15	not not > not
136.28	istapt > is apt
137.11	*shā* > *sthā*
137. fn 328	*read as*: *apalāpya. avadābhya-*
139.23	P > by P
139.26	ahowing > showing
141.19	*tuuda* > *tunda*
141.22	*read on 'Guṇa,' fn. no.*: 337
141.29	*read as*: *sukhāharaṇayoḥ*
142.2	*tuuda* > *tunda*
142.30	*read as*: *mūlavibhu . . .*
143. fn 344. *last line*	*esā* > *eṣā*
144.4	*nākha* > *nakha*
154. fn 370.6	*read as*: *-pratyayārtham*
155. fn 374	**91** > **93**
158.6 *fr. bel.* (*col* 2)	*read as*: *khanakī*
161.7	*rañjaha-* > *rañjaka-*
161. *last line*	*read as*: √*jihvāyakīyiṣa-*
163.2 *fr. bel.*	*omit*: two sets of
163. fn 384.4	6.1.4 > 6, line 1
164.1	Kty and Ptj > P and Kty
167. *last line*	*read as*: *carcā-*
168.5	*read as*: *Karmopapada*
170.6	*read as*: 2.2.8 t
172.25	3.3.1.7 > 3.2.1.7
172. fn 408.1	y > *y*
176. fn 420	*read as*: *annāḍitamā*
176. fn 421.3	*read as*: *lakṣaṇena*
179.16	*kumbhi* > *kumbhī*
181. fn 432.2	*ṣeṣṭhī* > *ṣaṣṭhī*
182. fn 439.5	*read as*: *grāma. . . .*
182. fn 439.7	*pa* > *ṇa*
184.2 *fr. bel.*	*bhikṣa* > *bhikṣā*
185.21, 24	*read as*: *pañcāla-cāra-*
186.8	*read as*: *saṁjñāyām*
188.7	*read as*: *saṁghāto*
189	*See fn.* 454 *matter, on p.* 190
190.11	*ksīra* > *kṣīra*
190.17	*svrā* > *surā*
190.18	*read as*: *sīdhu-pī-*
190.25	*pi* > *pī*
191.10	*taṇī* > *taṇi*
191.25	*read fn. no. as*: 459
193.11	*omit* ^{3} *on the bracket*
196.3	the the > the
197.8	*read as*: *Pañcālas*
197.14	*read as*: *pañcālāñś*
197.17	*read as*: *kurucarā*
199.4	*read fn. no. as*: 477
200.2 *fr. bel.*	**76** > **72**
202.6	an > the
202. fn 483.1	in > *in*
203.1	*read as*: *KHAŚ*
203.3 *fr. bel.*	*nādi* > *nāḍi*
204. fn 404.2	*read as*: *samānayoga-*
205.1	*dhamā-* > *dhmā-*
205. fn 498.4	*read as*: *tṛtīyā. . .*
208. fn 514.1	*read as*: *Kaṭhopaniṣad*
211.2	*add*: Vt 3.2.3.1
211.7	*read fn. no. as*: 518
212.2	*See fn.* 524 *matter, on p.* 211.
212.16	*read fn. no. as*: 526
212.20	*read on 'viha-ga-', fn. no.*: 527
213.10	been > been seen
213.19	*read as*: Obviously, this
214.12	or > of

215.1	*sārvatra* > *sarvatra*
215.7	*read fn. no. as*: 533
216.5	*read fn. no. as*: 536 *See in-matter, on* p 217.
216.7	*brahm* > *brahma*
217.1	*read as*: ANA_3
217.20	*kaaṇa* > *karaṇa*
222. fn 545.5	arya- > *arya-*
223.23	646 > 546
224.6	*read on 'gaṇa', fn. no.*: 548
224. fn 548	*saptnyādi* > *saptnyādi* (4.1.35); *utkarādi* > *utkarādi* (4.2.90); p. 59 > pp. 219-21
226.14	61.6 > 61.1
226.16	*read on 'do,' fn. no.*: 552
226.25	*read as*: *duroṇasat*
228. fn 556.5	*read as*: *kravyāda-*
233.1	or > of
233.4	*read fn. no. as*: 563
234.23	*read on 'Ptj,' fn. no.*: 570
234.26	*read on bracket, fn. no.*: 571
234. fn 569:	**147 > 148**
236.7	*read fn. no. as*: 574
237.4	*yo* > *yo'*
237.13	*read fn. no.*: 580
237.17	*read on 'bhuj,' fn. no.*: 582
238. fn 584.4	*at* > at
239.10	*read on 'copyate,' fn. no.*: 595
239.10	*read on 'copyate,' in. no.*: 595
239.21	*read fn. no. as*: 597
245.	*read* (67) *as*: *grāmagāma-
251.	*read in* (276): *dadhṛ́ṣ-*
252.	*amāvasyā-* > *amāvasyā-* or ***amāvāsyā-***
261.20	*read line as*: × *apalāpya-* **30,** (305), p. 29, p 83n, p 137n
264.16 *fr. bel.*	*read entry as*: *māṁsakāma-*
264.15 *fr. bel.*	*read entry as*: *māṁsakāmā..* (213)
264.14 *fr. bel.*	*read as*: °*bhakṣa-*
265.7	*read as*: (171)
266.	*read as*: *kukṣi*

Rs. 40/-